INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS
Theory and History
(Upto World War II)

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS
Theory and History
(Upto World War II)

VOLUME I

URMILA SHARMA
S.K. SHARMA

ATLANTIC PUBLISHERS AND DISTRIBUTORS

Published by
ATLANTIC PUBLISHERS AND DISTRIBUTORS
B-2, Vishal Enclave, New Delhi-110 027
Phones 5413460, 5429987

Sales Office
4346/4C, Ansari Road, Darya Ganj,
New Delhi-110 002
Phones 3273880, 3285873, 3280451
Fax 91-11-3285873

Copyright Dr Urmila Sharma, 1997

No part of this book may be reproduced in any form without permission from the publisher except for the quotation of brief passages in criticism

Typeset at
Shiva Graphics
B-45, Chanakya Place, Delhi

Printed in India at
Mehra Offset Press, Delhi

Preface

Books have been written in all sizes on International Relations both from the point of view of Theory and History. This book seeks to discuss International Relations, both in theory and history since its beginning to World War II. Without going into unnecessary historical details, it has been confined only to landmarks in the history of international relations. Thus it is a brief, to the point and upto the mark narration with central, side and running headings to make the subject matter clear. The subject matter has been presented in an easy and comprehensive style. The language used is free from technical jargon. Examples have not been unnecessarily multiplied. Questions, actually asked in university examinations, have been given at the end of each chapter, giving an occasion for exercise. Thus, the book has all the characteristics of an ideal textbook for the readers and a reference book for the teachers of the subject.

With their long experience of teaching the subject the authors have judiciously chosen salient points and necessary examples only so that the student may not be lost in unnecessary details. Suggestions for improvement, however, are most welcome.

Urmila Sharma
S. K. Sharma

Contents

	Chapter	*Page No.*
	Preface	*V*
1.	Introductory	1
2.	International Law and International Relations	17
3.	Theories and Approaches to International Relations	40
4.	National Power : Value and Elements	67
5.	Rise of Sovereign State Systems	78
6.	Sovereignty	88
7.	Nationalism and National Interest	94
8.	Foreign Policy	111
9.	Diplomacy	120
10.	Role of Ideology	139
11	The Balance of Power and Power Vacuum	146
12.	Imperialism and Colonialism	163
13.	Alliances, Allegiance, Isolationism and Nationalistic Universalism	175
14.	War and National Policy	190
15.	International Relations Before and After World War I	205
16.	The League of Nations	233
17.	Collective Security	254
18.	Mandate System and Disarmament	286
19.	Reparation, War Debts and Economic Depression	300
20.	Italy and Rise of Fascism	308

21.	Rise of Nazism in Germany	314
22.	Turkey Under Mustafa Kamal Pasha	327
23.	Rise of Soviet Russia	331
24.	Spanish Civil War	336
25.	International Relations in Middle East (1919 to 1945)	342
26.	British Foreign Policy	353
27.	Foreign Policy of United States of America	361
28	Foreign Policy of Japan	370
29.	Second World War (1939—1945)	379
	Bibliography	390

1

Introductory

The earliest traces of international law were of regional character, in the form of rules recognised by states in immediate contact with one another. Relations between states in the earliest historical times were maintained within relatively narrow geographical areas. The points of contact between them were few . So little had they the character of law that it would be too much to call these rules regional international law.

Treaties in Middle East

Treaties between Egyptian pharaohs and neighbouring kings, entered into as far back as the fourteenth century B.C., provided for the recognition of their mutual sovereignty and equality, as well as for the extradition of political refugees and immigrants. Similar treaties were entered into by David, Solomon and later Hebrew kings with neighbouring states, other than the seven nationals marked for examination. Instances are to be found showing a care for the faith in treaties and a recognition of the sanctity of ambassadorial character. However, there was little to suggest that other states or their inhabitants had any rights as such . In ancient times, wars were waged freely and hostilities were conducted without restraint. The description of the Assyrian coming down like a wolf on the fold applies equally to Babylon, Medes and Persians, Pheonicians and Carthaginians and even the Jews . In spite of their recognition of a higher moral law and in spite of the ideals of peace proclaimed by their prophets, Jews surpassed their neighbours on certain occasions in the slaughter and extermination of the enemy.

Regional Laws in the East

Among the member states of the ancient Chinese and Indian empires, regional law began first to take more definite shape. Lofty precepts of universal conduct may be found in the writing of the Chinese philosophers of the Golden Age. However, their application appears to have been confined in practice to the separate states of the empire, the "world" as it was known to China. In ancient India, the epic narratives and codes of law, concerning treaties of obligations toward other states, were applicable chiefly to separate states within India itself. Even within that limited circle they appear to have been as often violated as observed.

LAWS AMONG GREEK CITY-STATES

The precepts of the philosophers of China and India were important within their respective circles They had no perceptible influence upon the body of law that came to be formulated in Western Europe in the seventeenth century This law dominated the international community at the beginning of the twentieth century The bond of unity among the Greek city-states was far more highly developed than the regional law of China or of India It was the consciousness of a true community of interests With it a rudimentary form of international law developed within the narrow circle of Hellenic world City-state met city-states upon the basis of mutual recognition of independence and legal equality In the world of the nineteenth century, it was modified by alliances of separate states, by religious and political league, and by the hegemony of successive individual state A high foundation for union was based upon their common race, religion, language and customs These bonds might have been expected to develop some form of Hellenic federation, or at least some form of mutual cooperation for the common welfare and for mutual defence against the common enemy However, they failed to do so Greece fell a victim to the inability of its statesmen to extend their outlook beyond the range of their city-stated except upon rare occasions

Inter-State Relations

This inability of Greek statesmen to develop the spirit of regional unity within the Hellenic circle was due to the strong sense of local patriotism developed within the city -states The forces of creative imagination which led to the development of the highest civilization that the world had yet known led to concentration upon the national interests of the separate states The emphasis upon the character of the individual man, upon a humanity, which made possible the leadership of Greece in the civilized world and which produced works of literature and of art that became a standard for subsequent generations, tended create rival communities, isolated from on another by the intenseness of their loyalty to their own small circle Independence played the same part to the Greek city-state as lit has played in our own times If they had the word sovereignty they would have used it

Value of Greek International Law

Due to the peculiar city -state organization of ancient Greece, the system of international law developed there It bears a closed relation to that of modern times than does the international law of any subsequent period down to the year *1948 Greeks were aliens in other cities but their own* However, as aliens they possessed rights, based partly upon the universal law of hospitality and partly upon special treaty provisions The right of asylum was regarded as of divine origin It was particularly sacred in connection with Greek temples Ambassadors were exceptionally privileged Elaborate formalities attended their reception

Their persons were regarded as inviolable. Severe punishment was meted out to those who maltreated them. Arbitration was frequently resorted to for the settlement of disputes. Agreements to submit disputes of a definite or of a general character to arbitration were to be found both in treaties of peace and in alliances between separate states. A treaty of alliance in 418 B.C. stipulated that they would submit their differences to arbitration "on fair and equal terms according to their ancestral customs". But while numerous rules of international law relating to minor interests were developed between the city-states, they failed in the essential task of developing a system of collective security for the maintenance of peace.

International law in India

In ancient India, as in ancient Greece, one may find the beginning of international law in the East, though within the state, in this subcontinent itself. Ambassadors were respected. They were inviolable. Foreigners were protected. Treaties were entered into by the stated. Their conditions were religiously observed even if they were not written and only verbal. Thus Mahabharat, Ramayana and other ancient scriptures and full of accounts which may be the foundation for international law even in our own times.

ORIGIN AND GROWTH OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Present Compulsions

In the beginning of the human civilisation and prior to the emergence of states, the scope of international relations was too narrow. But since the later half of the nineteenth century its scope has been widened because of states felt it necessary to maintain international relations among themselves on the principle of "Live and let live", which is absolutely necessary for the purpose of international peace and understanding . With the development of means of communications, growth of international trade and commerce and advent of science and technology, the nations were found coming together more closely than they were expected in pre-war periods. The two world wars were landmarks in the development of international relations and diplomacy.

Nations of the world were compelled to realise the fact that the war is not the effective means to solve clash of interest. They came to realize that if they are able to maintain good and friendly relations among themselves, there would be perpetual peace lint the international community and only under peaceful situations they can make progress within their societies. In the present world situation no state can run smoothly in isolation from other states. The modern states find that international law has become law of cooperation and mutual understanding . He proper establishment of relationship between national interests and international obligations has become a necessity for each and every state, big or small.

Complexity of the Modern World

The complex nature of modern world has resulted in the impact of actions of one nation on the others It has made necessary a proper establishment of relationship between national and international obligations, the lack of which causes tension and conflict There has been an increasing awareness in the community of nations that their prosperity depends on mutual friendly relations The traditional concept of military pacts and alliances has not disappeared and some significance is attached to them even now Socialist thought and capitalist blocks are continuously trying to enlarge their areas of influence, they do realise that their success depends only on compromise and co operation The power situation has compelled even the great powers to maintain friendly relations with other states Under the Charter of the United Nations it has been laid down that the member-states must try to compromise and co-operate and must apply peaceful methods for solving their disputes They must adhere to the principle of peaceful co existence "Live and let live" Today, international relations are based on this principle rather than on military pacts and alliances which had created mutual tensions between diverse groups under traditional international law

Media of International Relations

The present world is composed of several states having a politically self-governing sovereignty with varied political, social and economic systems The racial and cultural strains are divergent from state to state The nature of the State Governments also varies The varying politico socio-economic systems have given rise to different political systems, each having a foreign policy of its own in matters of dealing with other states Some of them have democratic governments while others have totalitarian form of governments, the difference in their political, economic and social systems have compelled them to adopt different foreign policies towards other states In democratic countries, the department dealing with the foreign policy of a State is known as the Department of International Affairs or Foreign Affairs It deals with the international affairs of a nation in relation to all other states of the world community It ascertains its responsibilities and obligations towards the international community It tries to protect its national interests abroad Through diplomacy it safeguards its territorial sovereignty, integrity and security

ELEMENTS OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

International affairs condition domestic affairs of a state Domestic policy and foreign policy are co-extensive, co-existing and complementary to each other It is damaging for a country to have different policies for its internal and external affairs What a state does at home is bound to be reflected in its dealings with other countries No state can adopt a foreign policy which is detrimental to the interests of the world community There are certain

factors which are responsible for determination of the foreign policy of a country in relation to other states. The international relations are largely affected by these factors. Following is the classification of elements of international relations.

Factors Determining Foreign Relations

Main Factors	Additional Factors
(i) Geographic	(i) The historical-psychological, sociological factor
(ii) Economic	(ii) The organisational-administrative factor
(iii) Demographic	(iii) The military factor.
(iv) Strategic.	

IS INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS A DISCIPLINE ?

According to Palmer and Perkins, "Although the study of international relations has emerged from its earlier status as a poor relation of political science and history, it is still far from being a well-organized discipline. It lacks a clear-cut conceptual framework and a systematic body of applicable theory; and it is heavily dependent upon other and for the most part better-organized disciplines. But it does have certain features which set it apart from other disciplines, and, above all, it has a particular approach to the problems with which it deals."[1]

Some behaviourally-oriented students insist that international relations is on the way to becoming a science, or at least that this should be the object of all those who are trying to give greater meaning and significance to the field. Measured by any rigid test, international relations is clearly not a science, nor is it even a discipline, if one accepts C.Dale Fuller's definition that this requires "a body of data systematized by a distinctive analytical method and capable of permitting predictions with exactitude."[2]

However, Stanley Hoffmann has argued that it is possible to distinguish the field of international relations for analytical purposes, and that therefore it "should be treated as an autonomous discipline."[3] In practice it is being so treated in many programmes featuring both teaching and research. Hence, the question "Is international relations a discipline?" admits of no more than a

1. Palmer and Perkins, *International Relations*, XII.
2. *Training of Specialists in International Relations* (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1957), p. 26.
3. Stanley Hoffman, *Contemporary Theory in International Relations*, p. 1.

pragmatic answer Applying Morton Kaplan's criteria that "a discipline implies a set of skills and techniques, a body of theory and of propositions, and a subject matter,"[4] international relations, as a field of study and research, may be regarded as a discipline Certainly it has a distinctive methodology, distinctive theories (if not a general theory), and a distinctive subject matter, however fluctuating and ill-defined its boundaries may be

DEFINITION OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

The term international relations has been interpreted and defined in two senses - narrow and broad In the narrow sense it is confined to the study of 'official relations conducted by authorized leaders of the State" According to Prof Dunn, international relations are "the actual relations that take place across national boundaries or as the body of knowledge where we have of those relations at a given time" The relations between businessmen, scientists, etc, of the various countries are excluded from the scope of international relations by emphasizing official relations Following are some important definitions of International Relations

1. Palmer and Perkins "The study of international relations is not a science with which we solve the problems of international life At its best it is an objective and systematic approach to those problems"[5]

2 President Wilson "Open covenants of peach openly arrived at, after which there shall be no private international understandings of any kind, diplomacy shall proceed always frankly and in the public view" Thus demand for open diplomacy heralded the birth of a new science of international relations The study of International Relations as a systematic discipline started after the First World War

3. Hartmann In the broader sense international relations include "all intercourse among states and all movements of people, goods and ideas across national frontiers However, as a field of study its focus is on the processes by which states adjust their national interests to those of other states"

4 Stanley Hoffmann "The discipline of international relations is concerned with the factors and activities which affect the external policies and the power of the basic units into which the world is divided"[6]

5. Trygve Mathiesen International relations embrace "all kinds of relations traversing state boundaries, no matter whether they are of an

---

4 Morton A Kaplan Is International Relations a Discipline?" *The Journal of Politics* XXIII (August, 1961), 464

5 Palmer, N D and Howard C Perkins, *International Relations* (1985), CBS Publishers, Chapter 1

6 Introduction in Stanley Hoffmann ed, *Contemporary Theory in International Relations* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J Prentice-Hall 1960), p 6

economic, legal, political or any other character, whether they be private or official", and "all human behaviour originating on one side of state boundary and affecting human behaviour on the other side of the boundary". While it cannot be denied that the relations conducted by the sovereign states are most important and the political relations tend to dominate this field of study, certain other important groups also influence the interactions of the sovereign states.

SCOPE OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

International Relations include and cover all aspects of topics which, from the point of common sense, are relevant for the purpose of international studies. Its foundation lies in the desire of mutual adjustments of national interests which the states amongst themselves seek to protect and achieve in the widely divergent physical, geological, geographical and climatic situations and environments governing them. The field of the study of international relations is international society. Its scope includes the evolution and structure of international society, the actions on the international scene, the patterns of their behaviour and the driving forces being their actions and finally, the problems of international planning. The management of the relations of States in the mid-twentieth century requires increasingly complex governmental machinery, both national and international. A variety of agencies and media are used, ranging from complex peace keeping organisations, such as the United Nations, to ordinary, bilateral negotiations. All these institutions contribute to the scope of international relations.

International Affairs and International Relations are similar terms. International affairs or relations are sometimes identified with foreign affairs. This implies a contrast to home affairs. It is said that international affairs are of less importance than matters nearer home. In an age of world wars, nuclear weapon systems and space vehicles, such an attitude to "foreign" policy is wrong. The reverse position is nearer the truth. International affairs condition domestic affairs.

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS AND INTERNATIONAL POLITICS

Some modern students, particularly those who specialize in the study of political behaviour, hold that the failure on the part of writers and practitioners of international affairs and diplomacy to make a distinction has contributed to a semantic confusion in the study of international relations today. International politics should deal with the politics of the international community in a rather narrow sense, centering on diplomacy and the relations among states and other political units, whereas international relation is a term properly embracing the totality of the relations among peoples and groups in the world society. Those

who subscribe to this broader and more nebulous term differ on the role of international politics in international relations, some of them would assign it a major role, while others would subordinate it to various cultural, social and psychological forces in the world environment

Most students would agree that the term "international politics" is used primarily to "describe official political relations between governments acting on behalf of their states,"[7] *although at least one political scientist has* asserted, rather cryptically, that " 'international politics' today is not conducted between or among nations, nor in its most important phases even between states "[8] The term "international relations" is broader and less easily circumscribed

As Stanley Hoffmann has suggested, "the discipline of international relations is concerned with the factors and activities which affect the external policies and the power of the basic units into which the world is divided",[9] and these include a wide variety of transnational relationships, political and non-political, official and unofficial, formal and informal

According to Palmer and Perkins "international relations" is a broader term than "international politics," and that its study is being enriched by the wider and more versatile approaches and methods currently being pursued, but they also believe that the new insights and techniques should be employed to understand better the "core" as well as to explore the peripheries of the field Further, while the historian, the economist, the geographer, the sociologist, the psychologist, the anthropologist, and other specialists make their distinctive and indeed indispensable contributions, the fact remains that the working relationships of states are conditioned most of all by the enactments and engagements of governments, however much these may be predetermined by underlying conditions and forces Moreover, the use of "international relations" to mean essentially "international politics" is by no means a deliberate effort to exclude the non-political

International relations include in their study the totality of relations of any people and group in the world society They include all aspects of relations between countries and people, political or non-political, peaceful or war-like, legal or cultural, economic or geographic, official or non-official *As Harold and Margaret Sprout put it, this term is used "to designate all human* behaviour on the other side of the country " The term 'relations' has a variety of meanings such as contacts, connections and action and reaction Hence, the

---

7 John Hanessian, Jr, "The Study and Teaching of International Relations . Some Comments on the Current Crises," *SAIS Review* X (Summer, 1966), 29

8 Herbert J Spiro, *Politics in Africa Prospects South of the Sahara* (Englewood Cliffs, N J Prentice-Hall, 1961), p 12

9 Hoffmann, op cit , p 6

scholars have tended to define international relations as actions on the part of a group-state or government-directed towards another group which reacts to them. The term international politics, on the other hand, connotes the politics of international community in a rather narrow sense concerning mainly diplomacy and international relations have a much wider connotation than international politics in so far as these embrace all sorts of relations among people and groups in the world society and these relations operate both at the official as well as non-official levels. On the other hand, international politics includes only those aspects of international relations in which conflict of purpose for interest is involved. To quote Padelford and Lincoln, "In its broadest sense, the field of international relations comprises myriads of contacts among individuals, business organisations, cultural institutions and political personalities of many different countries. When people speak of international relations, however, they are usually thinking of the relationship between states as such. This is to be expected in view of the fact that it is states which make the vital decisions affecting peace and war and that it is their governments which have the authority to regulate business, travel, commerce, use of resources, political ideas, territorial jurisdiction, nationality, communications, employment of armed forces and other aspects of international affairs. The relationship between states is described as 'international politics', that is, the interaction of state policies. This is the core of contemporary international relations."

Expanding Scope of International Relations after First World War

The scope of international relations has very much expending in modern times. Initially international relations were concerned only with the study of diplomatic history. Its scope was confined to the study of contemporary foreign affairs with a view to draw certain lessons. Later on, emphasis was laid on the study of international law. Now international relations began to be studied within the framework of international law with the establishment of the League of Nations after the First World War. The field of the study of international relations was further widened to include the study of international organisations and institutions.

Expansion of Scope after Second World War

In the post-World War II period, the scope of international relations was further widened due to significant changes such as emergence of USA and USSR as two super powers; the entry of a large number of non-European states into the society of nations; the danger of thermonuclear war; increasing interdependence of states and rising expectations of the people in the under-developed world, etc. Greater emphasis is now being placed on scientific study of international relations. It led to development of new methodologies. It introduced new theories in the study of international relations. The scholars

began to study the military policy of the country as well as the behaviour of political leaders More emphasis is now laid on area studies The state has ceased to be the sole factor in the study of international relations More importance is being attached to the individual and other corporate sectors Thus, the present scope of international relations is quite extensive It embraces the study of diplomatic history, international politics, international organisation and administration, international law, are a studies as well as psychological study of the motives of member states in their mutual relations In recent years scholars have tried to study the forces underlying the practices of the states to build a comprehensive theory of international relationships They have made serious efforts to utilise the social science techniques and establish verifiable propositions

Is International Relations an Indefinite study ?

Despite enormous expansion in the scope of international relations, some writers still hold that as a subject of study it is "a poor relation of political science and history and is still far from being a well organised discipline It lacks clear cut conceptional framework and a systematic body of applicable theory, it is heavily dependent upon other better organised disciplines " According ing to Alfred Zimmern, the distinguished Professor of History who was offered the first chair of International Politics at the University of Wales in 1919, "from the academic point of view, International Relations is clearly not a subject in the ordinary sense of the world It is not a single subject but a bundle of subjects Of what is this bundle composed? Of law, economics, political science, geography and so on — but not the whole range of these subjects "

Modern scholars do not treat international relations as an independent discipline Independent discipline implies some sort of unity of subject-matter and unanimity regarding its scope as well as a good degree of objectivity These requisites of discipline are lacking in international relations It also does not possess clear boundaries which separate it from political science It lacks objectivity and more often than not assumes subjective character Hence, the subject is far from being an independent discipline To quote Organski, "As a science, international relations today is in its infancy, it is still less a science than a mixture of philosophy, history and art Its theories are few and shockingly untestable Writings on the subject are largely descriptive However, the descriptive-historical approach has resulted in the collection of an immense amount of data; and the daily papers provide us with more New theorists are beginning to provide the kind of theoretical framework that is necessary for ordering and interpreting the facts We are on the verge of great discoveries (and) within next few decades the basic foundations of a new discipline will be laid "

METHODS OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

In the discussion of the international relations among the nations, methods to establish international relations hold a 'key place'. Different schools of thought have been devised and each has formulated a distinct method. As an academic discipline international relations is still engaged in the search for the most suitable tools with which to handle its tasks. In this field, naturalist writers started their inquiries from *a priori* positions and deduced their conclusions from a state of nature which they pictured in terms of either *"homo homini lupus"* or the brotherhood of man. In our time, the spectacle repeated itself in the controversy between the so-called realists and idealists in the field of international relations. What is required is a primary approach to international relations, in which the apparent antinomy resolves itself into a new synthesis. Power never has been — nor is — effectively internationalised. This does not prove that it cannot be internationalised. Conversely, day dreams on the future of international relations are no excuse for shirking a critical analysis of existing international society. Thus, a realistic position is perfectly compatible with constructive views on what can or ought to be.

HISTORY AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

What distinguishes the empirical approach to international relations from those of other social sciences ? It has been suggested that this subject should be considered as a branch of history and in particular, of modern or contemporary history. It has been pointed out that the present-day international society is a product of a historical evolution which has extended over a number of centuries. When seen in international perspective the evolution of the present international society has developed on the ruins of previous international societies. But the critics point out that the essence of the historical treatment of any topic, be it history, a person, people, science, age or civilization, emphasises on the evolution of the phenomenon analysed. This aspect of the matter is important for the understanding of international affairs. The analysis of the growth of international society is one of the objects of international studies. Yet, an important problem would remain unexplored if international relations were condemned to the one-way road of the historical treatment of its subject. In that case, it would hardly be possible to do justice to the structure of present-day international society, the typical patterns of behaviours of international society, or the factors determining the historians to annex the study of international relations to their realm. Trade barriers are a noticeable feature of the present-day international relations. Historians will tell us the reasons why this or that State has adopted such protective measures. Economists can furnish an exposition of the technical devices used in economic life. It is clear that problems of international relations cannot be adequately answered by the use of any one method rigidly fixed in advance. The choice of the tools will vary with the material and the purpose of the investigation in hand. In view of the complex

character of international relations, the student may have to combine several techniques to attain convincing results including that of the historians

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS AND SOCIOLOGY

The study of international relations is a branch of sociology concerned with international society International Relations cannot have any exclusive association with any particular branch of knowledge other than sociology itself History, Law, Economics, Geography, Psychology, Anthropology and even the Natural Sciences may contribute techniques potentially helpful to the student of international relations Which of these branches of knowledge are required to form any particular basis of methods depends on the topic to be examined Thus, international relations share with Sociology thedifficulties which arise from the necessity of using a variety of methods because all branches of knowledge have developed to such an extent that it is difficult to master any one of them On the other hand, the controversial character of international relations is well known This is a sufficient reason for ruling out International Relations as an academic discipline At the same time, International Relations may claim to be favoured in the abundance of contemporary material The student of international relations is able to draw on a rich storehouse of common knowledge and readily accessible material Thus, Sociology provides essential flesh to the body of international relations At the same time it throws immense light on the social factors influencing the relation among the nations While a society is the means to an end a community is an end in itself Whereas a society is based on interest and fear, a community requires self sacrifice and love The one is found on distrust and the other on mutual trust The members of the society remain isolated in spite of their association, and those of community are united in spite of their separate existence Inside a society individuals and groups concentrate on the pursuit of their own self-interest This is so on the international plane Every member state of the international community looks first to its self-interest while maintaining international relations with other states Until international society is transformed into an international community, groups inside international society tend to do what they can rather than what they ought This is the essence of power politics Power Politics is one of the most common terms surfacing on the international relations since First Great War

FACTORS IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

1. Geographic Factor The location of a state, its climate and size are factors which influence its foreign policy in relation to other states The foreign policy of a state is determined by the geography of that state The geographical position of a state determines its foreign policy As Jules Cambon puts it, "The geographical position of a nation is the principal factor conditioning its foreign policy — the principle reason why it must have a foreign policy at all " According

to A. Chamberlains, "The geographical factors have been decisive for the course of British history and explain, just as they dictated the main principles of British policy and the pre-occupation British statesmen." If the geographical position of a country is sound, and its climate is healthy, if it is rich in food-stuffs and raw materials, it must follow an independent foreign policy. Thus the geographical position and historical developments are determining factors of foreign policy of a country. Regardless of changes in the form of government, the foreign policy of a country has a natural tendency to return again and again to the same general and fundamental alignment. For example, if a state is strategically situated having natural barriers like seas, mountains, terrains, deserts etc., it is not vulnerable to foreign invasions. Such strategically situated country may follow independent foreign policy in relation to other states.

On the other hand, if a country lacks in these geographical factors, it has to follow the course of the neighbouring states in her relation with them. It cannot follow an independent foreign policy of its own. A country which *has unfavourable geographical position is not able to keep itself isolated from* the events happening in its neighbouring countries. For example, Great Britain is surrounded by seas on all sides and the English Channel serves as the most effective barrier to foreign invasion of British Isles. Hence, Great Britain remains secure and continues to be a great power. The United States of America with its geographically isolated position on the globe has brought such power and strength to it that it is able to compete Great Britain.

2. Economic Factors. Economic factors hold a key place in affecting the relation of a state with the rest of the world. The chief elements of such economic factors are (i) self-sufficiency, and (ii) capacity to provide food, raiments and shelters to its population. As nature has unevenly distributed its wealth all over the world, no country can claim that it is wholly economically self-sufficient.

(i) *Self-Sufficient.* A state may be purely agrarian or agricultural. It may be rich in its raw materials and food-stuffs but lack in mineral resources as coal, iron etc. Such states cannot be industrially advanced. Again, a state may be rich in mineral resources hence it may be an industrially advanced state. There is the third category of states which may be styled as the balanced states. These are capable of producing enough food for their population and establishing industries out of the resources within their territories, such as Great Britain, the U.S.A. and the Soviet Union. However, they also cannot pretend to be self-sufficient as they have to depend upon other states for import of raw-materials without which their industries cannot run successfully. Thus, the so-called balanced states are able to exert influence on other states and become big powers in course of time. Such are the Great Britain, or the United States or the Soviet Union or China. Besides the huge supplies of raw

materials and natural resources essential for a country for becoming a big power, a large population is essential to bring about greater industrial and agricultural output as well as for raising a powerful army and navy The development in China is an illustration on this point It has become one of the Five Big Powers of the World Very recently it has taken its seat in the 15 members Security Council of the United Nations

(ii) *Capacity to provide needs* However, population alone cannot make a country strong if it goes on increasing population day by day without a corresponding increase in production The case of India is such an example If a country does not control its population corresponding to its production it must look for some other territories to accommodate its increased expansionist policy Hence, Japan invaded Manchuria, China occupied Tibet for similar ambition Germany clashed with the Allied Powers To quote Simonds and Emeny "The desire to acquire markets and to possess new lands rich in natural resources, to ensure the prosperity of larger population at home quite as much as to obtain territories abroad suitable for colonisation was policy in the case of certain Great Powers of Europe in the closing quarters of the nineteenth century, and in fact to the very eve of the World War itself"

3 Demographic Factor The demographic factor includes size of the population and the ethnic circumstances

(i) *Large Population* A nation becomes great and powerful if it has both a growing large population and efficient industrial production The Soviet Union and the U S A are big powers only because they have large population and a marked industrial development In contrast to the above India though having a large population has not become great power because it is not industrially so advanced as to satisfy its needs Thus the size of the population and efficient industrial population determine the extent to which a nation can claim to have an independent foreign policy of its own Otherwise the size of population contributes to the weakness of a country Greater the size weaker the economic position of a country is

(ii) *Ethnic composition* Another demographic factor is the ethnic circumstances of a nation Countries having a single race or nationality have no internal problem to solve These are free to pursue an independent foreign policy On the other hand, the countries which have various races or nationalities are bound to face numerous internal problems The recent segregation of Pakistan with Bangladesh is due to the fact that Pakistan is composed of several racial groups India is composed of several racial groups but the constitution of this country has solved the internal problems of India Hence, there is no likelihood of this country being split up into different nations It shows that there may be unity despite diversities

4. Strategic Factors : (i) ***Secured Frontiers.*** The military strategy of a country is an important factor determining the foreign policy. It is closely connected with the national security. If a country has effective protective natural barriers, it seldom worries about its security. British Isles and Japan are surrounded by oceans on all sides and they enjoy the position of islands. Thus, the natural barriers of these countries afford protection from foreign aggression. As they are surrounded by oceans on all sides, they are able to have strong navy to safeguard the frontiers from foreign attacks. Hence, they are considered as great naval powers. Besides seas and oceans, mountains, rivers, snow, deserts, swamps and forests play significant roles in safeguarding the territories of a country. The Soviet Union and Switzerland are among the few countries which have the most secured frontiers. Both of these countries have played important roles in international affairs as they are straightened by the most effective protective natural barriers.

(ii) ***Distance.*** Distance is another factor influencing the foreign affairs of a country. Countries which are isolated from the disturbed areas of the world due to distance, remain unaffected by these disturbances. The location of the U.S.A. on the globe keeps it unaffected by the holocast of Europe and Asia.

5. Historical-psychological-sociological factors. If a country has a bold history, and its people are ready to sacrifice their blood for their motherland, its morale always remains high. No country can pursue an independent foreign policy if the morale of its people is not high and their national character is not strong. These elements are necessary for adopting an independent policy by any country or nation.

6. Organisational and administrative factors. These constitute the form of the government within a political society and the attitude of the people towards it. Majority of foreign issues may be decided by a sound governmental organisation and an efficient public administration. A government which has strong support from its people lasts long. It is able to deal with the foreign affairs peacefully. Thus, general support of the government and the efficient administration are very important factors for the formulation of sound foreign policy.

7. The Military Factor. The military factor very much determines the foreign relations of a country. It has been considered from various aspects, *e.g.*, size of the armed forces, quality and morale of army men, quantity and variety of weapons and equipments which determine the foreign relations also.

CONCLUSION

The above discussion reveals that the geographic, economic and demographic factors are the principal factors from which the other factors may evolve and develop. No country can become great power if it does not possess the above factors. All these factors must be realised and compounded together. To know

the physical circumstances of a state is a prelude to understand its national policy To know the extent of its resources is to perceive the strength which it can mobilize to support that policy In order to persuade a people to change its policy, it is necessary to modify the circumstances which are responsible for it To compel a state to abandon its policy, it is necessary to muster a force decidedly superior to the force of that state These simple facts constitute the foundation of international relations They should be considered in the light of the doctrine of the absolute sovereignty of individual state

QUESTIONS FOR EXERCISE

1 Discuss the position of International Relations during the early part of human civilisation

2 Point out the nature of international relations during the early period of civilisation

3 Discuss the Origin and Growth of International Relations

4 Discuss the essential ingredients of international relations

5 Define the term "international relations" and dwell upon the chief methods applied to it for its study as an academic discipline

6 What do you mean by the term international relations"? Can it be identified with foreign affairs ? What is the relation between (a) History and international relations (b) Sociology and international relations, (c) Power politics and international relations

7 'International Relations is not simply the relations between two nations but something more than that' Elucidate

8 'International Relations covers all intercourse among states and all movements of people goods and ideas across the national frontiers ' Discuss

9 Explain the scope and methods of international relations

10 Explain the relationship of international relations to History and Sociology

2

International Law and International Relations

International law is common to all states. It incorporates the experience of many centuries during which peoples have lived together and have done business with each other. It may be spoken of as the moral code of states, for it is the body of rules upon which they have agreed so that they may survive. Some writers contend that in reality international law is a law among states — not over them. The difference is a fundamental one. It involves the basic nature of the state system. As Palmer and Perkins put it, "Indeed, international law must be studied with the realization that it not only presumes the sovereignty of states but also seeks to preserve sovereignty — that, in general, it has been the friend rather than the enemy of sovereignty."[1]

Definitions of International Law

1. *Oppenheim.* It is "the name for the body of customary and conventional rules which are considered legally binding by civilized states in their intercourse with each other." He added that it is "a law for the intercourse of states with one another, not a law for individuals" and that it is "a law between, not above, the single states."[2]

2. *Ellery C. Stowell.* "International law embodies certain rules relating to human relations throughout the world, which are generally observed by mankind and enforced primarily through the agency of the governments of the independent communities into which humanity is divided."[3] International law is "generally defined as law applicable to relations between states."

3. *Phillip C. Jessup.* "The recent trend in the West, particularly in the United States, is toward a less technical view of the law. The increasingly influential school of international law created by Myres S. McDougal of Yale

1. Palmer and Perkins, *International Relations,* p. 266.
2. L. Oppenheim, *International Law* (New York : Longmans, Green & Co., 1905), I, 2.
3. Ellery C. Stowell, *International Law* (New York : Holt, 1931), p. 10.

University regards law as a process of decision into which all relevant factors, and not merely technical norms, enter It virtually identifies law with policy and calls the study of law "a policy science"[4]

4. *Charles G.Fenwick.* International law is primarily "the body of rules *accepted by the general community of nations as defining their rights and the* means of procedure by which those rights may be protected or violations of them redressed[5]

ATTITUDES TO INTERNATIONAL LAW

The Communist Attitude

The Communists regard traditional international law, as an instrument of the capitalist, imperialist West, designed to preserve the *status quo* A standard Soviet definition of international law was given in 1948 by A Y. Vyshinsky, who called it "the sum total of the norms regulating relations between states in the process of their struggle and cooperation, expressing the will of the ruling classes of these states and secured by coercion exercised by states individually or collectively"[6] This definition was also presented in the textbook on international law published in 1957 by the Institute of State and Law of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, with the addition of a reference to "peaceful coexistence" as coming within the purview of international law Although Y Korovin in 1961 went so far as to insist that "Contemporary international law may be defined as the international code of peaceful co-existence"[7] A year later, a statement by G I Tunkin head of the Treaty and Legal Department of the Soviet Ministry of Foreign Affairs, reaffirmed the more typical Soviet view that international law reflects "the struggle and cooperation of states, and, first of all, of states of the two systems"[8] "It is this Soviet stress on antagonism rather than cooperation as the primary characteristic of the relations between the states of 'the two systems' that sets narrow limits to the role of international law in world affairs"[9]

Attitudes toward international law appear to reflect the difference in the ideologies and policies within the Communist world, "from the relative moderation of the Yugoslav government at one end of the spectrum to the intransigence of the Communist regime in mainland China at the other"[10]

---

4 Phillip C Jessup, *Transnational Law* (New Haven Yale University Press, 1956)

5 Charles G Fenwick, *International Law* (New York Century, 1924) p 34

6 "Mezhdunarodnoie Pravo i Mezhdunarodnaia Organizatsiia' *Sovetskoie Gosudarstvo i Pravo* No 1 (1948) p 22 quoted in Lissitzyn, pp 16 17

7 "International Law Today," *International Affairs* July, 1961, p 19

8 "XXII S ezd KPSS i Zadachi Sovetskoi Nauki Mezhdunarodnogo Prava," *Sovetskoie Gosudarstvo i Pravo* No 5 (1962), pp 12 13, quoted in Lissitzyn p 17

9 Lissitzyn p 17

10 *Ibid* p 35

The official position of the Chinese Communists toward international law is still in the process of formulation. In general, like the Soviet leaders, they follow the Marxist Leninist approach, with perhaps even more emphasis on the struggle between systems and on the political rather than the legal approach to foreign affairs. In the words of Anthony R. Diekhs, "When it becomes necessary to raise legal questions, the Chinese government some times make skillful use of traditionally accepted international rules, suiting them to its own characterization of the facts of the situation. At other times, the generally accepted rules are sidestepped by a varying combination of orthodox and Marxist argument. Like the Soviet Union, the Chinese People's Republic has chosen an extremely nationalist and conservative formulation of state sovereignty as the most effective legal safeguard of her freedom of action."[11]

International Law in Developing Nations

The developing nations of Asia and Africa exhibit a distrust of traditional international law, a belief that the traditional norms are not binding on them, and a strong desire for the development of international law to meet the needs of the modern world. These nations want to be sure that international law does not become an instrument for the preservation of the *status quo* which may stand in the way of measures to promote de-colonization, self-determination, human rights, and the social use of natural resources. They are inclined to give more emphasis to the "progressive development of international law" than to its codification. Unlike the Communists, they have a positive view toward international law. In most instances they are inclined to accept, or at least to abide by, its traditional norms. Most of them are ready to join international organizations, become parties to multilateral conventions and treaty arrangements, and play as active a role as possible in international life. Yet, as Oliver Lissitzyn has pointed out there is among the developing nations, "a perceptible current of discontent with traditional international law."[12] Judge Radhabinod Pal, a distinguished Indian jurist who wrote a famous dissent in the Tokyo War Crimes Trials and who was a member of the International Law Commission of the United Nations, wrote that they ought not "to be bound by rules of international law which they have not helped to create and which very often ran counter to their interests."[13] "There is also, a desire to incorporate in it [international law] certain principles that have been usually regarded in the West as political rather than legal and that, by their very generality and

11. Anthony R. Dicks, "Chinese Attitudes to International Law (I)," a memorandum dated October 9, 1964, privately distributed by the Institute of Current World Affairs, New York, p. 16.
12. Lissitzyn, p. 38.
13. Quoted in "Future Role of the International Law Commission in the Changing World," *United Nations Review*, IX (September, 1962), p. 31.

flexibility of application lend themselves to manipulation The non Western nations tend to use such principles as weapons in their effort to do away with the remnants of Western domination in both political and economic spheres "[4] The new states place great stress on the concept of self determination which they advance vigorously in their anti colonial crusades and in their efforts to assert their economic and social as well as political independence This orientation is reflected in the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples adopted by the General Assembly of the UN in December 1960 which affirmed that *all peoples have the right to* self determination

BRANCHES OF INTERNATIONAL LAW

Public and Private International Law

To distinguish it from what is known as private international law a branch of the law which deals entirely with the relations of persons living under different legal systems the international law is at times spoken of as public international law Private international law applies when justice requires that the law of some outside jurisdiction be applied in a particular case Frequently the nationality of a person is the issue As Professor Edwin D Dickinson stated There is a host of problems concerning the adjudication and regulation of matters of private right and duties which arise uniquely from the continuing movement of persons or things from one nation to another and from the increasing ease with which relationships of agreement family property enterprise or the like may be consummated across national frontiers [5] Private international law is a term more current in Europe than in the United States American lawyers commonly use conflict of laws to mean the same thing in relation to the laws of states of ie United States

Admiralty and Administrative Law

Admiralty law which is the law of maritime commerce resembles private international law as a large part of it is concerned with differences between separate national jurisdictions In the United States the system of admiralty or maritime law which prevails by general consent in all commercial states has no inherent force of its own It is operative only to the extent that it has been adopted by American customs or law

Administrative law consists of the body of rules growing out of the regulations adopted by international administrative agencies as for example the Universal Postal Union

---

14 Liss tzyn p 39

15 Edwin D D ckinson *Law and Peace* (Ph ladelphia Press 1951) p 59

International Comity

The term "international comity" has been the subject of much controversy. When the courts of one state gave force to the laws of another state in order to render justice to the parties involved, they did so as a matter of comity or grace. Some writers would abandon the term entirely as it has been applied in private international law. It is used in public international law to explain the practices which states more or less consistently observe, even though they are not legally bound to do so. Comity thus influences the growth of international law.

Subject Matter of International Law

International law proper, public international law, is divided into the law of war and the law of peace. Hugo Grotius called his great pioneering work *On the Law of War and Peace;* Oppenheim's classic treatise consisted of one volume on peace and one on war. It was believed that public international law is made up of two separate and distinct branches, with the law of war being necessary to regulate the rights and obligations of belligerents and neutrals when the law of peace is no longer applicable. But today the boundary lines between war and peace are becoming more obscured. The new techniques and new weapons of destruction have made conventional laws of war inadequate, if not obsolete.

The International Law Commission listed twenty-five topics in the field of international law : (1) Subjects of international law; (2) Sources of international law; (3) Obligations of international law in relation to the law of States; (4) Fundamental rights and duties of States; (5) Recognition of States of Governments; (6) Succession of States and Governments; (7) Domestic jurisdiction; (8) Recognition of acts of foreign States; (9) Jurisdiction over foreign States; (10) Obligations of territorial jurisdiction; (11) Jurisdiction with regard to crimes committed outside national territory ; (12) Territorial domain of States; (13) Regime of the high seas; (14) Regime of territorial waters; (15) Pacific settlement of international disputes; (16) Nationality, including statelessness; (17) Treatment of aliens; (18) Extradition; (19) Right of asylum; (20) Law of treaties; (21) Diplomatic intercourse and immunities; (22) Consular intercourse and immunities; (23) State responsibility; (24) Arbitral procedure; (25) Laws of war. Each one of these twenty-five topics raises fundamental questions of international conduct and obligations each has been the subject of careful examination and discussion.

EXPANDING SCOPE OF INTERNATIONAL LAW

In recent years, there has been a marked tendency to develop principles of international law to apply to questions, which in the past would probably have been regarded as outside the scope of international law. An outstanding

example is the effort of the UN General Assembly and a Special Committee of the Assembly to develop "principles of international law concerning friendly relations and co-operation among states"

International Law in Outer Space

The advent of the space age has moved international law, beyond the territorial sphere In 1959 the General Assembly created a Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space In September, 1963, this committee was urged to continue its "efforts to find solutions in the legal field in order to match the continuous scientific and technological progress in outer space"[16] Three months later the General Assembly unanimously adopted a Declaration of Legal Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space[17] In it, it was stated that outer space and celestial bodies are not subject to national appropriation and are free for exploration and use by all states It *recommended that consideration be given to incorporating principles governing* space activities "in international agreement form, in the future as appropriate"

Other Types

International Criminal law as illustrated by the Nuremberg and Tokyo War Crimes Trials and the Genocide Other fields of international law expanding in scope and significance are international constitutional law, international administrative law, international labour law, international commercial law, international corporation law, international anti-trust law, international tax law, and international economic development law As Professor Wolfgang Friedmann has pointed out, these new fields "are developing from a far-reaching interpretation between public and private law," and may in fact be evolving "the form and authority of new international norms"[18]

The subject matter of international law is expanding rapidly in volume as well as in scope This is illustrated by the formidable achievements in the codification of international law, the development of international legislation The number of treaties and other international instruments, etc The major contributors to international law are, of course, the United Nations and its affiliated agencies "Despite the U N 's political paralysis, its various subgroups have probably created more international laws in the past 20 years than enacted in all previous history"[19]

---

16 U N Document A/AC 105/PV 20 October 10, 1963, p 6

17 General Assembly Res 196 (XVIII), December 13, 1963

18 Wolfgang Friedmann, *The Changing Structure of International Law* (New York Columbia University Press, 1964) pp 152-87

19 *Time*, May 28, 1965

Laws of War

Laws of war on land and sea have been formulated through various codes and conventions, particularly by the conventions drafted at the Hague conferences of 1899 and 1907 and in many Geneva conventions. Following aspects of warfare were dealt with in these documents : privateering, blockade, prize courts, the care of sick and wounded, protection for medical personnel and facilities, the qualifications of lawful combatants, the treatment of prisoners, forbidden weapons and agencies, the powers of military commanders in occupied enemy territory, the status of spies, the beginning of hostilities, the use of merchant vessels as warships, naval bombardments, the use of submarine mines, the right of capture in maritime warfare, the rights and duties of neutrals, and the use of poison gases. On some of these subjects the agreements were largely nullified by sweeping reservations. On others the agreements were never ratified. In the convention on the treatment of prisoners of war[20], the law is detailed and explicit. However, a substantial part of the laws of war is still based on custom and usage.

The laws of war have helped to humanize warfare. Even the totalitarian states have more generally observed them than disregarded. However, they have not tried to prevent the most inhuman practices, such as unrestricted submarine warfare and the use of flame-throwers, napalm, and atom bombs. Laws of war have never been adequately revised to cover the new and more terrible weapons of destruction that were developed during World Wars I and II and in intervening years. They have not been adapted to meet the needs of the atomic age.

Laws of Neutrality

Before the First World War an important offshoot of the laws of war, the laws of neutrality, were concerned with the forms of neutrality and of neutralization, the proclamation of neutrality, and especially the relations between neutral states and belligerent states and between states and individuals. The problems involving the rights and duties of neutrals were the maintenance of the inviolability of the territorial jurisdiction of neutrals; the obligation of neutrals not to permit the use of their territory as a base for military operations; the regulation of the rights of asylum and of internment; the conditions under which enemy ships may enter and leave neutral ports; the obligation of a neutral state not to furnish military assistance to any belligerent or to permit enlistment of troops for a belligerent state; and the neutrals' obligation to enforce its neutrality laws.

---

20. James Wilford Garner, "Laws of Warfare," *Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences* (New York : The Macmillan Company, 1937), XV, 363.

In World War I traditional laws of neutrality lost much of their meaning They were flagrantly disregarded They appeared to be largely inapplicable to the use of such new weapons as the aeroplane and the submarine Woodrow Wilson insisted on the rights of the United States as the greatest neutral state This led to strained relations with Great Britain over interference with American ships, goods and nationals and to the American declaration of war upon Germany Germany's use of the submarine was, to the President, a clear violation of America's rights as a neutral power Traditional laws of neutrality have never been satisfactorily revised since that time During World War II, they seemed quite anachronistic Writing before World War II, Phillip C Jessup declared that "it may well be argued that in the present or future condition of world solidarity, neutrality is an anti-social status "[21]

The Laws of Peace

The subject matter of the international law of peace embraces the bulk of the matters with which the international lawyer usually deals In a brief chapter on "The Law of Nations " Professor Dickinson delineates "six grand aspects or divisions of the subjects"

1. *The law relating to the nation-state* It is "the traditional and principal subject of law in the international system," with particular attention to "its birth, recognition, life and death "

2. *Nationality* It deals with "the principles which determine human allegiance to the nation, including the severance of allegiance and the protection of nationals abroad "

3. *National Laws.* It is "the law of the national domain or homeland, including such earthy business as acquisitions, transfers, boundaries, internal authority and external responsibility "

4. *Laws of jurisdiction*

5 *Laws of intercourse and agreements.*

6. *The settlement of disputes* International law is rather well developed in these areas At the same time, however, there as "characteristic weaknesses," "important gaps," and "extraordinary paradoxes in the law"

It is due to the character of the international society where "The law has developed among the members of an organized community of basically dissimilar subjects "

International Law and Municipal Law

While International law is largely concerned with relations between

---

21 Philip C Jessup, "Neutrality," *Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences* (New York The Macmillan Company, 1937), XI, 364

states, municipal law controls relations between individuals within a state and between individuals and the state. Both are similar because of their sources in custom and express agreement. However, both have substantial differences in legislative machinery and judicial processes. Both are usually applied by national courts. It results in complete decentralization of the judicial function in international law and effective centralization in municipal law. Most municipal laws are enforced by a responsible executive unknown to international law. Traditional international law always depended for its enforcement upon the initiative of the injured party.

In the event of a conflict between international law and domestic law, Oppenheim held that the national courts could not apply the law of nations, for "the latter lacks absolutely the power of altering or creating rules of municipal law."[22] On the other hand, Clyde Eagleton insisted that "to admit that international law is ultimately dependent upon domestic law and courts, or that municipal law may override international law, would be to deny international law outright, and no state makes such a denial"; the "decisions of the courts putting its [the state's] own law above international law are not final, but may be reviewed and reparation may be demanded by an international tribunal."[23] After World War I, the constitutions of Germany and Austria specifically made international law a part of municipal law, and that court decision achieved the same result in the United States.

The Sources of International Law

The sources of international law are treaties, custom, and general principles of law. The Statute of the International Court of Justice (Article 38) stipulates that the Court shall apply :

(a) international conventions, whether general or particular, establishing rules expressly recognized by the contesting states;

(b) international custom, as evidence of a general practice accepted as law;

(c) the general principles of law recognized by civilized nations;

(d) ... judicial decisions and the teachings of the most highly qualified publicists of the various nations, as subsidiary means for the determination of rules of law.

Here (d) merely indicates means by which (b) and (c) may be determined.

1. Treaty. Law as fixed by treaty or convention is a fairly objective one. This however, presents at least two difficulties. One is the matter of

---

22. Openheim, I, 26.
23. Clyde Eagleton, *International Government*, rev. ed. (New York : The Ronald Press Co., 1948), pp. 48-49.

interpretation, and the other is that of knowing just when a rule becomes international law

2. Custom It is often difficult to prove that a particular rule has been accepted in practice by the community of states, even though the various states have never reached an explicit understanding to that effect The rule must be proved by the presentation of evidence from judicial decisions, diplomatic correspondence, state papers, and the findings of research societies and private scholars

3 The "general principles of law". These have been variously spoken of as justice, common sense, and right reason These are principles common to the great legal systems of the world, determined with some degree of objectivity They make it possible for judges to fill in the gaps between the rules of "positive law"

265244

ENFORCEMENT OF INTERNATIONAL LAW

Traditional international law recognized a right of self-help on the part of injured states World public opinion has long exerted some pressure on states to observe the rights of other states and of individuals However, no international organisation intervened to enforce the law Each state was the judge in its own cause While states possessed a right of action on behalf of themselves and their citizens, no right of action was lodged anywhere in the international community when a state mistreated its own nationals

Thus under traditional international law, self-help, or, more formally, unilateral action, was the ultimate means of enforcement

NATURE OF INTERNATIONAL LAW

Austinian school, insisted that international law is not law at all but a branch of international morality Other declare that the matter is one of definition Still others staunchly defend the validity of the term International law, unlike domestic law, is very limited in scope The greater portion of international relations has not come within its jurisdiction at all Traditional international law has applied only to those subjects on which states have *agreed that it should apply Economic discrimination*, imperialism, and war were not necessarily violations of international law

It is argued that international law is not true law, because it is not binding It is impossible to reconcile the dogma of sovereignty with the idea of a law to which states must submit whether they like it or not More generally, it is held that states enter the community of nations with the assumption that they accept its laws, and that the continued general observance of certain rules of conduct implies a tacit acceptance of those rules J L Brierly, an English authority on International Law, argued that the views of Jean

Bodin and Thomas Hobbes, the great champions of absolute and indivisible sovereignty, never meant to underwrite international anarchy, as some of their followers have done."[24] He added that "the doctrine was developed for the most part by political theorists who were not interested in, and paid little regard to, the relations of states with one another, and in its later forms it not only involved a denial of the possibility of states being subject to any kind of law, but became an impossible theory for a world which contained more states than one." Thus, individual states may be bound by international law even against their will, but law must rest upon the general consent of the community of nations.

Some writers believe that in the absence of centralized legislative, judicial and executive authority international law is not a true law. It cannot be true law because "it is not enforced". The assumption of non-observance has been pretty well demolished by jurists from the time of John Bassett Moore to the present. Quincy Wright had this to say on the point of enforcement : "A considerable failure of realization is ... to be expected of any rule of jural law. Its status as law depends not only on objective observation that persons and official agencies within the society generally conform to the rules but also on subjective assumption of a duty to conform by such persons and agencies. If that assumption is generally made in the society, the rule may be valid law even though its imperfect observance and enforcement makes it ineffective."[25]

As Eagleton complacently remarked, "the theorist who wishes to deny to the law of nations the title of true law does not in the least affect the actual conduct of affairs in that society, nor the fact that those affairs are regulated by rules as well enforced and observed as those of domestic law."[26]

THE ORIGIN AND DEVELOPMENT OF INTERNATIONAL LAW

International law had its beginnings in the prehistoric world. As stated emerged in the ancient world certain peoples, particularly the Hebrews and the Hindus, asserted ideals of justice and order in the relations of states.

Pre-Grotian International Law

In the relations among the city-states, the Greeks made their greatest contribution to the law of nations. They also furthered orderly inter-state or international relations through their belief that these relations should be based upon certain rules. In their inter-city-state relations they acknowledged rules

---

24. J.L. Brierly, *The Law of Nations*, 6th ed., edited by Sir Humphrey Waldock (New York : Oxford University Press, 1963), pp. 7-16, 45.
25. Quincy Wright, *The Study of International Relations* (New York : Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1955), p. 220.
26. Eagleton, p. 53.

of warfare and diplomatic immunity They made considerable use of arbitration They evolved a system of maritime law

The Romans extended the authority of Rome by conquest and alliance until they achieved a world state Their legacy to international law was the ideal of a common citizenship and impartial justice everywhere the idea of a universal law, and the breaking down of the old isolationism and the old contempt for foreigners Roman jurists formulated the principles of the *jus gentium* or law of peoples, a body of rules and usages believed to be applicable to all peoples and resting upon natural justice These principles survived the fall of Rome and were accepted as part of the emerging international law towards the close of the Middle Ages Thus, the way was prepared for the modern belief that definite legal principles should control the relations of states International relations in the modern sense of the term began to develop with the rise of Britain, France, Portugal and Spain as nation-states Regulations became imperative for the conduct of war, the preservation of neutrality, the use of the seas in both peace and war, and the fixing of boundaries in colonial claims Agreements were made between states by treaty and conference The principles of Roman law respecting private property were applied to boundary lines and colonial claims, and a law of war was slowly formulated

There was a growing body of rules of conduct that states were approving by observance and commitment in the principles of Roman law, in practice and custom, and in what they called "natural law" Thus, international law was made by the actions and agreements of rulers It was collected and systematized by scholars through researchers in the past and current relations of states In the words of Pitman B Potter, "International law as now practised by the states of the world, is largely the product of private scholarship taken over later by the states more or less in spite of their natural instincts'[27]

The first of the important writers was Legnano, an Italian, whose study of the rules of war was written in 1360, and published in 1477, Six legal scholars produced notable works on international law in the sixteenth century These included Vitoria, a Spaniard who "laid down the principle that the nations formed a community based upon natural reason and social intercourse," Suarez, also a Spaniard, who "first distinguished between reason and custom as sources of international law, a distinction followed ever since", and Gentilis, a British subject of Italian extraction, who added historical and legal precedents to natural reason and natural law as sources of international law

---

27 Pitman B Potter *An Introduction to the Study of International organization* 5th ed (New York Appleton Century Crofts 1948) p 58

GROTIUS (1583-1645) AND NATURAL LAW

Hugo Grotius was the man destined to become known as the "Father of International Law". Born in Holland in 1583, he took the degree of doctor of laws at the University of Leyden at the age of fifteen. In 1609 he published *Mare liberum*, wherein he argued for freedom of the seas, a view then not generally held. Later he went to Paris, where he lived for ten years. In 1625 he published his great work *De jure belli ac pacis*, or *On the Law of War and Peace.*

With De jure belli ac pacis, particularly Part II, "the science of the modern Law of Nations commences ... because in it a fairly complete system of international law was for the first time built up as an independent branch of the science of law".

Characteristics of Grotius' Laws

1. Grotius would hold states to practice the same rules which regulate the lives of individuals and make the violation of them a crime subject to punishment.

2. Basing his judgment upon researches in the Scriptures, ancient history, and the classics, Grotius formulated the "law of peace" which became the foundation of his whole system.

3. Grotius argued that states may properly punish other states which violate the law.

4. Grotius accepted natural law — or right reason—as the primary basis for determining rules for the rightful conduct of states.[28]

Grotius defined The natural law or law of nature as "the dictate of right reason which points out that a given act, because of its opposition to or conformity with man's rational nature, is either morally wrong or morally necessary, and accordingly forbidden or commanded by God, the author of nature."[29] It was a theoretical approach which sought to assert what ought to be the law rather than to list the rules to which men and states had actually committed themselves by custom or agreement. While Grotius did not ignore positive law, which he called "voluntary law", he kept it distinct from the rules which he took from natural law. His formulation of the rules of state conduct resting upon natural law dominated thinking on international law for two centuries.

---

28. Cornelius van Vollenhoven, "Hugo Grotius." *Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences* (New York : The Macmillan Company, 1937), VII. 177.
29. Book I, Chapter I, Section X.

ZOUCHE (1590-1660) AND POSITIVISM

Richard Zouche, an Oxford professor of civil law, published a little book in which he asserted views quite opposite from those of Grotius Whereas Grotius had emphasized natural law and minimized customary law, Zouche reversed the order He is sometimes called as the 'Second Founder of the Law of Nations" Instead of using Grotius' term *jus genium* or law of nations, he used *jus inter gentes* or law between nations, thus supplying the "inter" for the term "international law', first used by Jeremy Bentham a century and a half later

THE THREE SCHOOLS OF THOUGHT

Nearly two centuries after 1625, during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, one finds three schools of thought

1. *The Naturalists* They took their cue from Grotius but often went far beyond him to deny all positive law

2 *The Positivists* They rejected Grotius' natural law and supported Zouche's customary law, some even outdoing Zouche and denying natural law lock, stock and barrel

3 *The Grotians* They accepted both natural and customary laws, although most of them given more importance to customary law than had Grotius

The writers of the first two-thirds of the century showed the influence of Grotius As scholars in considerable number delved into archives, they narrowed the field in which positive law was lacking As states more and more frequently entered into law-making treaties, they lessened the need for appeals to natural law Thus by the last third of the nineteenth century positivism had become the prevailing school of thought.

THE CODIFICATION OF INTERNATIONAL LAW

Legal scholars of the past half-century have accepted the separation of positive law and natural law The most significant development was an expanded interest in the collection and systematization of existing law and organized efforts to translate ideas of improved interstate relations into the law of nations by multilateral agreements These developments are commonly known as codification and international legislation

Codification

Code means to systematize the law in a certain field In the words of Eagleton "the codification of international law, if it means anything at all, means systematic legislation "[30]

30 Eagleton, p 207

Beginnings of Codification

The earliest attempts at codification were not made until the 1860, the first being a precis formulated in 1861 by an Austrian jurist. Two years later, in 1863, Francis Lieber (1800-1872) prepared *A Code for the Government of Armies,* which was used by the Union armies in the Civil War and by Germany in the Franco-Prussian War. In 1868 Bluntschli (1808-81) produced a more comprehensive codification, declaring that his intention was "to formulate clearly the existing ideas of the civilized world." In 1872 an American, David Dudley Field (1805-94), issued a *Draft Outline of an International Code,* and an Italian jurist, pasquale Fiore (1837-1914), published in 1889 a code covering the whole field of international law. An English translation was published by Edwin M. Borchard in 1915 as *International Law Codified.*

Institutional Codification

In 1873 was founded the *Institut de Droit International* and the Association for the Reform and Codification of the Law of Nations, which in 1895 changed its name to the International Law Association. The *Institut* issued a number of draft codes, the most being the *Manual of the Laws of War on Land,* published in 1880. A compilation of fifty-six "resolution" and "views" of the *Institut* was published in 1916 by James Brown Scott, Director of the Division of International Law of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. Like the *Institut* the International Law Association has concentrated upon the statement of law on particular topics founded in 1905. The American Society of International Law publishes a journal of notable excellence, *The American Journal of International Law,* but it does not emphasize codification.

The American Institute of International Law, devoted its energies almost exclusively to the drafting of codes, particularly as they embody practices in the Western Hemisphere. Founded in 1912 through the efforts of Alejandro Alvarez of Chile and James Brown Scott of the United States, this organisation was closely associated with the Union of American Republics and its Commission of Jurists. It enjoyed the financial support of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. In June, 1950, the Inter-American Council of Jurists acknowledged the "notable contribution" of the Institute and asked for its continued cooperation. The Institute's part in the codification of "American international law" has largely taken the form of making recommendations to the official organs of the Inter-American System. A German organisation, the *Institut fiir Internationales Recht* at Kiel, also did more in the direction of codification. Finally, a number of draft conventions were issued by Harvard University's Research in international law, set up in 1926 to aid the League of Nations in the work of codification. The first three of the drafts related to nationality, responsibility of states, and territorial waters.

Early Official Codification

Official codification began when the representatives of twelve states, assembled at Geneva in 1864, endeavoured to describe existing practice in *respect to the care of the wounded in battle* Meeting on the invitation of the Tsar of Russia at Brussels in 1874, representatives of the leading powers drew up a draft code of the rules of war on land, which was never ratified More ambitious ventures in codification were undertaken by the famous Hague Conferences of 1899 and 1907 The first conference approved a code of the law and customs of war on land and adapted to maritime war the principles formulated in the Geneva Convention of 1864 for the care of the sick and wounded in land warfare The second conference of 1907 adopted conventions on the codification of the rights and duties of neutrals and on certain phases of the conduct of naval warfare Both conferences also accepted many conventions that embodied new rules of international law In 1900 the United States Government published *The Laws and Usages of War at Sea* thus supplementing Lieber's rules of warfare on land In 1909, the leading maritime powers sent delegates to a conference in London to work out a code of warfare on the sea but the resulting Declaration of London was ratified by only a few states World War I soon prevented other efforts As Professor Fenwick says, "Until the creation of the League of Nations, attempts at codification were haphazard and *infrequent* "[31]

Codification of American International Law

Proposals for codification of "American International Law" were made at the Inter-American Conferences of 1889-90 in Washington and of 1902 in Mexico City The Third Conference, Meeting in 1906 in Rio de Janeiro, approved a convention for setting up a Commission of Jurists to draft codes of international public and private law In 1912 the Commission agreed upon a report on extradition and set up six committees to study *subjects for codification*

Revitalized by the Fifth Inter-American Conference at Santiago in 1923 the Commission submitted twelve projects of codification to the Havana *Conference of 1928* "It was at Havana," says Professor Bemis, "that the United States made its last defense of the interventions still unliquidated in the Caribbean "[32] There was clash between the United States insistence on recognition of international duties and the Latin American insistence on international rights The Havana Conference approved the Bustamante Code of private international law and invited the American republics to ratify it The United States declined to do so The Sixth Conference also directed the Commission

---

31 Fenwick, p 209

32 Samuel F Bemis *The Latin American Policy of the United States* (New York Harcourt, Brace, 1943) p 252

of Jurists to continue its work.

When the United States accepted the Doctrine of Absolute Non-intervention at Buenos Aires in 1936 it seemed that the American republics might regain their interest. Yet the Mexico City Conference of 1945 "recognized that the frequent attempts to codify international law up to that time had largely failed."[33] At the Ninth Inter-American Conference, held at Bogota in 1948, the machinery was again revised as part of the general reorganization of the Inter-American System. An Inter-American Council of Jurists was made one the three responsible to the governing body (the Council). The Inter-American Juridical Committee was made the permanent committee of the Inter-American Council of Jurists. All other juridical agencies were abolished. One of the four departments of the general secretariat of the Pan American Union was the Department of International Law and Organization which began the publication of the Inter-American Juridical Yearbook "to present a survey of the development of inter-American regional law during the current year". It continues the issuance of the Law and Treaty Series.

In its first meeting in Rio de Janeiro in May and June, 1950, the Council of Jurists approved a draft statute which included a detailed plan for development and codification. It directed the new Council of Jurists to "establish relations of mutual cooperation with the International Law Commission of the United Nations."[34] Although the Judicial Committee continues its work on the projects set up at Rio, the American republics have really not accomplished very much, though they have made a good start.

Codification by the League of Nations

In 1924 the Assembly and Council set up a Committee of Experts to begin the task. A Codification Conference met at The Hague in 1930 to consider three subjects : nationality, territorial waters, and the responsibility of states for damage caused in their territory to the person or property of foreigners. One convention and three protocols were adopted, but the delegates clung tenaciously to the practices of their respective governments, thus the venture of the League of Nations into the codification of international law accomplished nothing.

Codification by the United Nations

The United Nations Charter specifically provides for the codification of international law. The Generalf Assembly early created a seventeen-member ad hoc Committee on the Progressive Development of International Law

---

33. Edward O. Guerrant, *Roosevelt's Good Neighbour Policy* (Albuquerque : University of New Mexico Press, 1950), p. 80.

34. The draft Statutes of the Inter-American Council of Jurists are printed in *Annals of the Organization of American States*, II, No. 3 (1950), 278-90.

and its Codification, and assigned to it the duty of studying methods by which the Assembly could discharge its obligation under Article 13 of the Charter of "encouraging the progressive development of international law and its codification " In its report to the Assembly in September, 1947, the Committee recommended the creation of an International Law Commission, to which would be assigned the dual task of studying subjects of law not yet highly developed and the "precise formulation of the law in matters in which there was extensive practice, precedent and doctrine "[35]

The Committee recommended that the International Law Commission "consider ways and means of making the evidence of customary international law more readily available by the compilation of digests of State practice, and by the collection and publication of the decisions of national and international courts on international law questions "[36]

The General Assembly, established the International Law Commission on November 21, 1947, adopted a statute for its government, and later elected fifteen members of the commission for three-year terms In 1956 the membership was increased to 21, and in 1961 to 25

The ILC prepared a Declaration on the Rights and Duties of States It formulated some thougt not all of the principles of law underlying the Nuremberg War Crimes Trials It drafted a Law of Treaties The Nuremberg Principles assert that both individuals and governments are to be held responsible for "crimes against peace," "war crimes," and "crimes against humanity " Neither of the two formulations here achieved the status of international law

On December 18, 1962, the Seventeenth Session of the General Assembly adopted a compromise resolution,[37] recognizing the paramount importance in the "progressive development of international law and its codification" of the following seven principles (1) refraining from the use or threat of force, (2) peaceful settlement of international disputes, (3) non intervention in matters within the domestic jurisdiction of another state, (4) sovereign equality of states, (5) equal rights and self-determination of peoples, (6) cooperation among states in accordance with the UN Charter, and (7) fulfilment in good faith of obligations assumed in accordance with the Charter In 1963 the Eighteenth Session of the General Assembly decided to establish a Special Committee on Principles of International Law Concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States to study the first four principles and prepare a report on its conclusions and recommendations [38]

35 *International Organization* I (September, 1947) 492

36 *Yearbook of the United Nations 1946 1947* (New York United Nations 1947) p 259

37 General Assembly Res 1815 (XVII) December 18, 1962

38 General Assembly Res 1966 (XVIII) December 16, 1963

The U.N. Secretariat has drafted conventions on certain aspects of the status of the U.N. The International Court of Justice has prepared an agreement on its own status in the Netherlands. The Human Rights Commission drafted the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, two covenants on human rights, and the Convention on Genocide.

INTERNATIONAL LEGISLATION

Custom and treaties and the acknowledged sources of international law

Custom is not always easy to ascertain, for it involves deciding when a practice has become a custom and has achieved something like general acceptance. It is therefore upon treaties that the making of new international law has largely depended. Historically treaties have usually been bilateral, with a specific quid pro quo, with hallowed rights of notification, reservation, interpretation, and termination, and often with an implicit exclusiveness.

International legislation does not imply a specific procedure. Whatever device is used to reach an understanding, that understanding must be ratified by each individual state in order to be binding on that state.

While international legislation closely resembles the conventional multilateral treaty process, there are certain important differences. It seeks to assert rules of law rather than to compromise differences. It is commonly open to accession by all interested states. There is some evidence that states are now feeling a stronger moral obligation to accept the "legislation" in good faith. Ten years before the founding of the UN, Manley O. Hudson declared that international legislation was more important than international jurisprudence as a source of "currently developing international law".

The Congress of Vienna of 1815 "may be taken to have inaugurated the process of international legislation."[39] Agreements of continuing importance were reached on the classification of diplomatic agents and on the free navigation of the international rivers of Europe. The Conference of Paris of 1856, approved a declaration on the abolition of privateering which became securely fixed in international law. International legislation on telegraphic matters dates from 1865, on postal matters from 1874, and on weights and measures from 1875.

The League of Nations ushered in a new era of legislative effort. In its first dozen years the League produced more international legislation than had issued from all sources during the entire century before World War I or than was currently being issued from all other sources combined. The subjects included communications and transit; slavery; pacific settlement of disputes; the traffic

---

39. Manley O. Hudson, "International Legislation", *Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences* (New York : The Macmillan Company, 1937), VIII, 175. Used by Permission of the Macmillan Company.

in opium, women and children, arms, and obscene publications, buoyage and lighting of coasts, counterfeiting, uniformity of bills of exchange, and labour Under the persuasion of the League's Secretariat, States came to feel more and more bound to follow signature with ratification

Professor Hudson found at least sixteen different names for the understandings reached between or among states since the founding of the League act, agreement, arrangement, convention, covenant, declaration final act, general act, pact, plan, protocol, regulation, rule, scheme, statute, and treaty Its *International Legislation* covering the period from *1919* to *1949*, fills eight volumes Before its termination the League of Nations, Treaty Series had reached two hundred volumes

The United Nations Treaty Series, issued by the Secretariat, contains texts of treaties, conventions, and the life entered into by member states since the Charter became effective By 1967, 568 volumes in this series had been published

THE LIMITATIONS OF INTERNATIONAL LAW

Basically, all the limitations of international law are inherent in the present character of international society, in which the concept of a legal order is not generally accepted but is, in fact, regarded as actually inapplicable in the most vital areas of international relations These limitations consist of the following

(1) the incompleteness of the legislative function,

(2) various and serious limitations in the judicial function,

(3) the lack of effective enforcement,

(4) limitations on the scope and functions of international law, and

(5) widespread misunderstanding of the nature and purpose of the law

The Judicial Function

The problem of the judicial function may be said to be made up of the limitations arising from the following conditions

1 Nature of international judicial machinery. International law, for the most part, is enforced by national courts

2 Lack of compulsory jurisdiction International law does not require any state to submit its disputes to an international tribunal against its will

3. Ambiguity of the law. The ambiguity of the law arises in part from the lack of a judicial hierarchy and from the doubtful character of the rule of stare decisis It is also due in part to the vague and general terms in which international agreements are frequently expressed

4. Subjects as judges. Another serious defect in the judicial function is that the subjects of international law have also been its judges. Individual states or their agencies possess the right to interpret the law which they are under obligation to enforce.

5. Limitation of justiciable disputes. As states are not subject to compulsory jurisdiction, they distinguish between "justiciable" and "non-justiciable" disputes.

The distinction between justiciable and non-justiciable disputes is unknown to domestic law.

The Narrow Range of International Law

In discussing what he calls one of the "most serious shortcomings of the present system," Brierly asserted that "it is because the demands that international law makes on states are on the whole so light that its rules in general are fairly well observed." He pointed to the whole field of economic relations as one in which the individual states have exclusive jurisdiction over matters which often provide the causes of international disputes. Other areas he mentioned are immigration, naturalization, a state's treatment of its own nationals, and the choice in a form of government. "Law will never play a really effective part in international relations," declared Brierly, "until it can annex to its own sphere some of the matters which at present lie within the 'domestic jurisdictions' of the several states."[40]

International Law and International Relations

International law is only one aspect of international relations, and by no means the most important one. The great issues of international politics, involving issues of peace or war, are largely outside its purview. International law, is still in a very primitive stage of development. Professor Dickinson, a friendly critic, described it this way: "... as regards its institutions and procedures of adjustment the law of nations has been a jungle law imperfectly ameliorated by a fragmentary and hesitant progress in the direction of legal order."[41] In Professor Brierly's judgment, "the system is still at what we may describe as the laissez faire stage of legal development." Nevertheless, it represents a positive attempt to build and international legal order, in the absence of which peace and sanity in the international community are in constant jeopardy.

UTILITY OF INTERNATIONAL LAW

Warning against what he describes as the swing from overestimation to underestimation of international law, Professor Josef L.Kunz recalls that at

---

40. Brierly, pp. 74, 75.
41. Dickinson, p. 76.

the close of World War I "there was everywhere, in victors, neutrals, and vanquished, not only the will to achieve a better world through international law, but also the firm conviction that it could be done" After World War II came the flowering of the new "realism" with its emphasis on politics and power International law was not even mentioned in the Dumbarton Oaks Proposals, and it barely escaped exclusion from the UN Charter Whereas the Permanent Court of International Justice was busy in its early years, the International Court of Justice has had very little business Kunz protested against this "underestimation" of international law, he declared that the law is not "sterile" and that it must necessarily play an important role in international relations "[42] Professor Dickinson, followed a rather severe critique of international law with a volume of essays entitled Law and Peace, in which he affirmed his faith in international law as a realistic approach to peace [43]

Belief in international law as a basis of enduring peace was also expressed by Senator Robert A Taft He contended that the veto power in the Security Council of the United Nations "completely dispels the idea that any system of universal law is being established, for surely nothing can be law if five of the largest nations can automatically exempt themselves from its application "[44] "It seems to me", he wrote, "that peace in this world is impossible unless nations agree on a definite law to govern their relations with each other and also agree that, without any veto power, they will submit their disputes to adjudication and abide by the decision of an impartial tribunal "[45]

Kelsen asserted categorically that "it is the essential characteristic of the law as a coercive order to establish a community monopoly of force", in 1944 he proposed a Permanent League for the Maintenance of Peace, "with compulsory jurisdiction" for an international court and with the four guarantor states — the United States, Great Britain, China and the Soviet Union — as "the power 'behind the law' "[46] Jessup declared that "until the world achieves some form of international government in which a collective will takes precedence over the individual will of the sovereign state, the ultimate function of law, which is the elimination of force for the solution of human conflicts, will not be fulfilled "[47]

---

42 "The Swing of the Pendulum From Overestimation to Underestimation of International law," *The American Journal of International Law*, XLIV (January, 1950), 135-40

43 "International Law An Inventory," *California Law Review* XXXIII (December, 1945), 506-42, see also, the same author s *Law and Peace*

44 Robert A Taft, *A Foreign Policy for Americans* (Garden City, N Y Doubleday & Company, 1951) pp 39-40

45 *Ibid.* p 40

46 Kelsen, *Peace Through Law* p 66

47 Jessup, *A Modern Law of Nations* p 2

Professor Dickinson's approach was more cautious and perhaps more realistic while he admitted that "world law has yet to assure the order and decency which exclude violence and supplant anarchy," he was convinced that "there is a vast body that is useful, indeed indispensable, and contained in its practices and principles are great potentialities of growth." He advanced suggestions for the expansion and improvement of the law and of what may be called the international judicial system, but he took care to warn that labours on this front should be accompanied by accommodation at the highest levels. "Every day of peace is a time for the extension of law" — a time for moving forward on "a vast and complicated front."[48]

QUESTIONS FOR EXERCISE

1. What is International Law ? Discuss its utility in better international relations.
2. What are the sources of International Law ? Discuss its limitations.

48. Dickinsion, Law and Peace, Chapter IV.

3

Theories and Approaches to International Relations

According to Morgenthau "One of the reasons for the wide range of approaches to the study of international affairs and for the absence of an agreed-upon frame of reference is the lack of a basic theory" The scope of international relations has greatly expanded over the years Of late scholars have tried to build up certain theories of international politics Till very recent times, scholars paid no attention to the problem of policies as it ought to be They conceived international relations as a generalised picture of the international scene and did not build up any theories with a view to explain the behaviour on the international scene In recent years, under the impact of behavioural science, scholars have tried to build up theories of international politics and the scope of the subject has undergone great changes Instead of giving a historical narrative of the world events the scholars have preferred to discuss the events with a view to theories

Meaning of Approach

According to Vernon Van Dyke, an approach "consists of a criteria of selection-criteria employed in selecting the problems or questions to consider and in selecting the data to bring to bear; it consists of standards governing the inclusion and exclusion of questions and data" Thus an approach is a set of standards governing the inclusion and exclusion of questions and data for academic purposes It implies looking at the problem from a particular angle and explaining the phenomenon from it As different scholars have adopted different criteria for selecting problems and data and adopted different standpoints, one finds different approaches for the study of international relations

According to Hedley Bull, "Two approaches to the theory of inter national relations at present compete for our attention (1) the classical approach, that derives from philosophy, history, and law, that holds that general propositions cannot be accorded more than tentative and inconclusive states , (2) the scientific approach, whose devotees aspire to a theory of international

relations whose propositions are based either upon logical or mathematical proof, or upon strict, empirical procedures of verification."[1]

In fact, there are many varieties and combinations of these two approaches. Scholars who are more concerned with substance than with method, including most of the older generation, favour the first approach. Those who are particularly absorbed in methods and techniques, embracing a large proportion of younger scholars, prefer the latter. However the two approaches are not necessarily incompatible, and many scholars manage to combine them without difficulty and with fruitful results. Most students of international affairs agree with Morton Kaplan, one of the leading proponents of the scientific approach, that "None of us has achieved such success with his methods that he should be prepared to read others out of court."[2]

As a result of the new approaches, the study of international relations has become increasingly interdisciplinary, behavioural, comparative, and "scientific" in order to place the study within a broader and more meaningful theoretical framework, and to give it more adequate methodological and conceptual tools.

CLASSICAL OR TRADITIONAL APPROACH

According to Hedley Bull the classical approach is "the approach to theorising that derives from philosophy, history and law, and that is characterised above all by explicit reliance upon the exercise of judgement and by the assumptions that if we confine ourselves to strict standards to verification and proof there is very little of significance that can be said about international relations that general propositions about this subject must therefore derive from a scientifically imperfect process of perception or intuition, and that these general propositions cannot be accorded anything more than the tentative and inconclusive status appropriate to their doubtful origin."

The classical approach or the traditional approach was in vogue till the middle of the present century, though at present some writers continue to subscribe to it. The main objective of the traditional approach was "to report and analyse current international problems and to speculate on these sources and outcomes of various policy alternatives for specific states or for international organisation."

Thus the classical approach is basically normative, qualitative and value judgement approach. According to Grieves, by this approach, the value of a work is "usually measured by the reputation of the scholar, the extent to

1. Hedley Bull, p. 360.
2. Morton Kaplan, *System and Process in International Politics*, p. 476.

which his or her judgement is trusted the evidence of thorough research, the lucidity with which the discussion is presented, or the nerves touched with an eloquent or moving philosophical discourse" The classical approach nourished two dominant schools of international political thought 'idealism' and 'realism' It greatly contributed to the sophisticated understanding of the nature and determinants of international relations

The classical approach mainly concerns itself with the historical dimensions It lays emphasis on diplomatic, historical and institutional studies It had various variants, viz, historical approach, philosophical approach legal approach and institutional approach

(i) The Historical Approach The historical approach focused on the past or on a selected period of history to find out an explanation of what institutions are—how they came into being It makes an analysis of these institutions as they stand It helps in illuminating the present by drawing on the wisdom of the past

(ii) The Philosophical Approach The philosophical approach regarded the state as an agent of moral improvement of international relations It stood for attainment of perpetual peace It was defective in so far as it was abstract and speculative and far removed from reality

(iii) The Legal Approach The legal approach laid emphasis on the need of having a system of world law, to regulate the behaviour of nation states It insisted on a code of international law to ensure world peace and security It asked for evolving some legal machinery for resolving state conflicts through mediation arbitration or judicial settlement

The institutional approach focused on the formal structure for the maintenance of peace and enforcement of principles of international law It laid emphasis on the study of the organisation law, the organisation and structure of the League of Nations the United Nations, and other specialised agencies like ILO, UNESCO, etc The traditional approach possesses an element of normativism Scholars adopting these approaches made no effort to convert the study of international relations into a science

SCIENTIFIC APPROACH

The scientific or the behavioural approach becomes popular in the wake of the Second World War It lays emphasis on the methods of study rather than the subject matter It is based on the simple proposition that international politics involves people and hence it could be explained by analysing and explaining the behaviour of people as it is reflected in their activities in the field of international relations The scientific approach applies scientific method and ignores the boundaries of orthodox disciplines It insists that the central aim of the research should be to study the behaviour

of men. This approach is interdisciplinary. It draws upon various social sciences like sociology, psychology and anthropology. In the words of K.J. Holsti, "the scientific approach differs from the traditional approach in so far as there is a definite trend away from description, legal analysis and policy advice ... Its objective has not been to assess the main issues in the cold war or describe current international developments, but to create explanatory theories about international phenomena, and in some cases, even to propose the development of a general and predictive science of international relations."

Thus classical approach is concerned with the substance rather than the method. Scientific approach is concerned with the method rather than the substance. However, these two approaches are not necessarily incompatible. A number of scholars have successfully combined these two approaches to produce fruitful results.

THE REALIST APPROACH

Realism is a set of ideas which take into account the implications of security and power factors. The basic assumption underlying the realist theory is the perpetual existence of conflict among nations in one form or the other. It is, therefore, evident that a contest for power is going on in the world. This can neither be controlled nor regulated by international law or world government or an international organisation. Thus, realism unequivocally accepts the permanence of the struggle for power as its guiding principle.

Prominent realists include the classical theorists Thomas Hobbes and Nicolo Machiavelli and in recent years George Kennan Hans, J. Morgenthau and Henry Kissinger etc. The best exposition of the *realistic* theory of international relations has been offered by Morgenthau who says "International politics, like all politics, is a struggle for power. Whatever the ultimate aims of international politics, power is always the immediate aim. Statesmen and people may ultimately seek freedom, security, prosperity or power itself. They may define their goals if terms of a religious, philosophic, economic or social ideal. They may hope that this ideal will materialise through its own inner force, through divine intervention, or through the natural development of human affairs. They may also try to further its realisation through non-political means, such as technical co-operation with other nations or international organisations. But whenever they strive to realise their goal by means of international politics, they do so by striving for power."

Principles of Realism

In his Realist Theory Morgenthau laid emphasis on the following six principles.

1. Objective Laws. Politics is governed by objective laws which are based on human nature and psychology The political phenomena may be understood by developing a political theory based on human psychology and reason Morgenthau laid emphasis on ascertaining of facts and giving them meaning through reasons

2. National Interest. Morgenthau lays great emphasis on the concept of national interest He defines it in terms of power Politics cannot be understood in moral or religious terms but only on rational basis In other words, Morgenthau laid emphasis on presentation of a rational theory rather than indiscriminate description of the political study

3. Change in Interest. Morgenthau holds that national interest is not fixed It is moulded by the environment Thus he assigns important role to environment in the determination of political action

4. Prudence. Morgenthau asserts that universal moral principles cannot be applied to state's actions These must be modified, according to the circumstances of time and place The state is not expected to observe the same standards of morality as are observed by the individual The individual may say for himself, "Let justice be done even if the world perishes," but the state has no right to say so The individual may sacrifice his liberty for moral principles Prudence is sacrifice of liberty for moral principles It is the supreme virtue in politics Without prudence there cannot be any political morality

5 No identity in morality and interest. Morgenthau does not find any identity between moral aspirations of a nation and the moral law governing the universe He asserts that all political actors pursue their national interests This concept of interest saves the nation from political folly and moral excess

6. Autonomy. Morgenthau believes that political sphere is an autonomous as the spheres of the economist or the lawyer or the moralist The political actors think in terms of interest as the economist thinks interms of utility, the lawyer in terms of conformity of action with moral principles Though the realist theory admits the relevance of non-political standards of thought, but it treats them as subordinate to the standards of politics

Morgenthau ignores the moral aspect and insists on taking national interests as they are, the real guide to the formulation and understanding of international relations Kennan insists on adopting moral approach in the formulation of policy while safeguarding the national interests However, both of them regard the power politics as the basis of world political relations

Criticism

The realist approach has been severally criticised on the following grounds :

1. Ambiguity and Inconsistency. Realist theory suffers from ambiguity. It is inconsistent with reality. It offers no universally acceptable definition of power. Morgenthau takes power as a 'psychological relationship among states', but the psychological relations themselves are quite vague and it is not possible to study the same. The study of complex psychological relationships among more than 160 nation states of the modern world renders them even more complex.

2. National Power Interest not Paramount. Realist theory wrongly assumes that all men and states seek their national interests in terms of power. If it were so, there would be constant struggle going on between various states and there would be no systematic conduct of international relations and no mutual co-operation among the members of the international community. As Stanley Hofmann has rightly observed: "It is particularly uncomfortable when one's basic postulate about human nature is such that history cannot be anything but a tale full of sound and fury, signifying nothing. For it is a postulate which stresses the inevitability and universality of evil and which assumes that reason, far from following its own inherent impulses, is driven towards its goal by the irrational forces the end of which it serves. Now, this view makes it almost impossible to understand how there could be a rational theory of national human behaviour.

3. Power not the only goal. Realist theory wrongly assumes that power is the most important goal which the nations pursue. In fact other considerations also greatly influence the action of the states, such as wealth, cultural welfare, security, protection and promotion of ideology.

4. Static Theory. Realist theory is defective in so far as it treats the world as a static unit in which power is a permanent guiding factor. This is against the well-accepted fact that the nations go on changing from time to time.

5. Power not always the end. Criticizing the Realist theory Dyke says, "If power were always the end in itself, politics could be likened to a game the object of which is to select the current. It would presumably be a more bloody game than in chess or baseball, but still the outcome would be without moral significance. The victory of one participant in the game would be followed sooner or later by the victory of another, and life would be made up of endless round of meaningless struggles. Each victory would have demonstrated his power and that would be that."

6 **No morality of National Interest.** Morgenthau's conception that *national interest carries its own morality holds good only during the stable* periods when accommodation of national objectives is possible In the present condition however, when different nations are often ready to eliminate other nations, it would be wrong to assume that national interest carries its own morality

7 **Non-political activities do not seek** Morgenthau wrongly assumes that there is hardly any relationship or activity which does not involve power There exists a number of non-political relationships and activities which do not involve power, such as international sports events, circulation of books and other reading material, private letters and telegrams etc Morgenthau does not suggest any criteria for the separation of political activities from the non-political activities

8. **Limited Autonomy.** The realist theory wrongly regards the political sphere as autonomous as the spheres of economists, or lawyers or moralists Morgenthau is not quite clear about the nature of autonomy Though he maintained that a political realist should only deal with limited set of variables, yet in his book *Dilemmas of Politics* he asserts that politics must play the roles of the common integrating core He says that *politics must be concerned with* all the variables with which the other specialised spheres deal This leads to confusion

Advantages of Realism

Despite these above mentioned shortcomings of the realist approach it has three distinct advantages

1. **Persuasive.** It is persuasive and is supported by historical experience

2. **Re-evaluative.** The realist approach has given a jolt to scholars and compelled them to re-evaluate their own assumptions

3. **Implicit reliance on Realism.** Even those scholars who challenge the bases of realism have tended implicitly to rely on realist perspectives *which is a great compliment to this approach*

THE IDEALIST V/S REALIST APPROACH

The idealist approach regards the power politics as the passing phase of history It presents the picture of a future international society based on the nation of reformed international system free from power politics, immorality and violence It aims at bringing about a better world with the help of education and international organisation It found its echoes in the Declarations of the American War of Independence of 1776 and the French Revolution of 1789 Its most important spokesmen include Condorcet, Rousseau, Kant, Woodrow Wilson etc In 1795 Condorcet wrote a treatise

which contained the essential basis of idealism in the international relations. He visualised a world order free from war, inequality and tyranny which would be marked by constant progress in human welfare brought about by the use of reason, education and science. Rousseau's idealist views were reflected in *Fragment on War*. He says : "When thousands of bellicose people have slaughtered their prisoners, when thousands of doctors in the keep of tyrants have justified these crimes, do in truth man's errors matter or their barbarity to justice ? Let us not search for what has been done but rather for what should be done and let us dismiss evil and mercenary authorities who end up by making men slaves, evil and miserable." Kant made a strong plea for the prevention of war among states and creation of conditions for perpetual peace. The greatest advocate of idealist approach however, was President Wilson of USA. He gave a concrete shape to his idealism through the text of the Treaty of Versailles. He made a strong plea for world peace and international organisation. This idealists visualised a future system free from power politics, immorality and violence. They regard the power struggle as nothing but the passing phase of history. They proceed on the assumption that the interests of various groups or nations are likely to be adjusted in the larger interest of mankind as a whole.

Criticisms

1. Morality is not Practiced. Idealism could emerge only by following moral principles in mutual relations in place of power, which is not possible in practice.

2. *Elimination of Totalitarianism.* *To bring about order the totalitarian* forces must be crushed by all means through the use of democratic methods and the last necessity is the establishment of the world government.

3. Impractical. This theory runs short of factual position. The nations do not behave as they are expected. As a result the realism in international relations appears to be more near the truth.

4. Frustrating. A rigid adherence to idealism is likely to lead to frustration.

Looking at the glaring defects of the idealist theory, a middle course has been adopted by a school of thought called Eclecticism. Eclecticism does not regard either the realist approach or the idealist approach as completely satisfactory. They offer a synthesis of the pessimism of realists and the optimism of idealists.

Eclectic Synthesis of Realism and Idealism

According to Prof. Quincy Wright the term 'realism' and 'idealism' are ambiguous. They can be used to distinguish between short run and long run policies. Realism aims at the fulfillment of the short run national policy of the fulfillment of the immediate necessities. Idealism, on the other hand,

represents the long run policy aiming at the objectives to be realised in the future Thus realism cannot ignore the immediate needs for a rosy future Idealism cannot leave out the prospective future only to solve the bleak present Neither of these two approaches is wholly correct Both possess respective merits and demerits For a balanced understanding of international relations it is desirable that realism and idealism must be synthecised The statesmen should neither show total aversion to the norms and values nor complete disregard to reality The combination of realism and idealism is the best solution Carr has rightly suggested, "Where utopianism has become a hollow and intolerable sham which serves merely as a disguise for the interests of the privileged, the realist performs an indispensable service in unmasking it But pure realism can offer nothing but a naked struggle for power which makes any kind of international society impossible Having demolished the current utopia with the weapons of realism, we still need to build a new utopia of our own, which will one day fall to the same weapons"

THE CLASSICISTS-BEHAVIOURALISTS CONTROVERSY

In the 1960s a controversy started between science and traditionalism The debate persisted between the two groups belonging to classical schools, viz., idealists and realists Uptill the World War II the debate between the scientific school and the classical school centered around the method of study of international relations The controversy started with publication of an article by Hedley Bull in 1966 Earlier, several scholars, e g , E H Carr, Ifred Zimmern, George Schwarzenberger, Hans J Morgenthau, Martin Wright Raymond Aron had produced studies in international relations based on the classical approach It was Bull who brought to the forefront the question of relative merits and demerits of the classical and the scientific approach under two main heads, method and subject matter

Defence of Classical Approach

Bull maintained that the scientific approach was not appropriate for the study of international relations for a variety of reasons He put these reasons in the form of propositions to be examined by other scholars to clarify the real

1. Moral Questions The nature of the subject-matter of international relations is such that it cannot be examined merely with the help of the modern scientific tools The questions with which international relations is concerned are eventually moral questions

2. Basic Questions. The scholars of scientific approach have not attended to the basic questions and they have not been able to contribute much to the development of the theory of international relations

3. False Claim. It is not possible to accept the claim of the scientific theorists that their studies so far have only been in the nature of a beginning and that when they attain maturity they would yield a general, comprehensive and dependable science of the subject.

4. Disservice. The scientific theorists have done a great disservice to the theory of international relations by introducing the so-called method of models.

5. Fetishism. The scientific theorists are so much devoted to the scientific methods that they have made a fetish of them.

6. Need of Precision. There is a great need for precision in the theory of International Relations. It should cover entire range of subject-matter under study and not confined to the limited field of facts and data only as the scientific theorists view.

7. No self-criticism. These theorists have cut themselves off from history and philosophy which alone provides the means of self-criticism.

Therefore, Bull concludes that the thinking of the scientific theorists lacks the sense of enquiry into the conditions of recent history that have produced the present conditions of international life and a critical attitude to their own assumptions on the basis of which they have been proceeding with their study of international relations.

Defence of Scientific Theory

The scientific theory has been defended by Morton Kaplan. In his article "The New Great Debate : Traditionalism V. Science in International Relations," he made a counter attack on traditionalist. He argued that scientific method was more helpful in the study of international relations.

1. Confirmation of Motives. Conceding that human purpose is concerned with motives, Kaplan maintains that these motives are often confirmed by careful observation and analysis of the behaviour patterns of people. The traditionalists were wrong to maintain that scientific method are inappropriate in political world in which surprises may and to occur.

2. Necessary Risk. Against scientific theorists traditionalists believe that they often mistake their models for reality. The reply of the scientists is that this kind of risk is always involved in any kind of human activity. The psychologists, sociologists and anthropologists also are likely to make this kind of mistakes.

3. No exclusion of philosophy. Morton Kaplan denies the charges that the scientific school completely excludes philosophy in its analysis. He claims that there are several questions which are basically philosophical and with which the systems theory is closely concerned.

4 Theoretical Formulations The scientific approach is based upon the simple proposition like any other social activity that international relation involves people and hence it can be analysed and explained only by analysing and explaining the behaviour of the people as is reflected in their activities in the field of international relations The traditionalists do not believe in either the desirability or the possibility of such theoretical formulations The classical school contends that the general theory of human behaviour, which the behaviouralists are trying to evolve is inconceivable, although it concedes that a theory in the narrower field of international relations is not impossible The scientists concentrate on the collection of all the relevant facts and on the basis of these facts reach the conclusions as the facts speak

5 Analysis The traditionalists say that the facts cannot always speak for themselves and the scholar has to interpret them and give them the real meanings, and for this purpose dependence on individual insight and wisdom is essential which implies dependence on law, history and philosophy Thus for the traditionalists the judgement is important Behaviouralists stick to the view that real research is possible through the analysis of the facts without interference from the personal likes and dislikes of the researcher

Conclusion

Most of the scholars believe that both the traditional and the scientific methods can be used for fruitful study of international relations David Singer has observed "Science is not a substitute for insight and methodological rigour is not a substitute for wisdom both— imagination and rigour are y but neither is sufficient" David Vital too wrote that classical approach consists of two elements, the method and the subject matter As a method the classical approach insists on the need for borrowing from history, law and philosophy and on depending upon judgement, and as the subject matter, it is concerned with the general questions of the nature of the study, the role of the use of force, and the significance of diplomacy The subject matter of international relations is in fact not the same as classicists believe

Changes after II World War

After the Second World War a great deal of changes have taken place These made it necessary for looking at international relations from a different angle The scientific theorists are deeply involved in their techniques and purposes and it is hardly possible to make any generalisation about them The scientific approach suffers from the serious flaw that it puts exclusive reliance on methods and tends to stress that the method itself determine the nature of the subject matter The scientific theorists seem to will believe that the real crux of the subject matter of international relations would be revealed if they adopted the right methods and techniques

For a compromise between the two divergent approaches, Michel Hass proposed 'the bridge building' and Robert North applied for 'pluralistic posture. Both the scientific and the classical methods are useful in the study of international relations.

THE SYSTEMS THEORY

There has been no unanimity among scholars regarding the meaning of a system. Hall and Fagen defined the system as "a set of objects together with relationship between the objects and between the attributes." Colin Cherry defined it as "a whole which is compounded of many parts in an ensemble of attributes." According to Charles A. McClelland, the system theory has been applied in various disciplines and assigned a variety of meanings and definitions. It is the result of the behavioural revolution in social sciences. It developed out of the anxiety of their new social scientists to evolve a general body of knowledge of integrating the various disciplines of social sciences.

General Systems Theory

In the recent years efforts have been made to study international relations in the context of the systems analysis. These scholars believe that a scientific study of international relations can be made only if the relevant material is treated in terms of system action. The study of the action of the parts of a political system can be made in terms of an analysis of the actions of participating units. It is assumed that there is a system in international relations. The nations (states) being its parts are involved in the process of interaction as each nation (a unit) is in constant contact with 'the whole' or the international environment. Therefore, each system can be a sub-system in relation to a larger system. A nation's behaviour is "a two-way activity of taking from and giving to the international environment."

International System

The general system theory, like most theories in international relations research, has been borrowed from other disciplines, and the concept of international systems, subsystems, and subordinate state systems, past or present. James Rosenau, "has suggested that systemic research be pursued not only in terms of local, national, and international systems — that is, actors and their relational pattern as a focal point—but also in terms of issue areas."[3]

---

3. James Rosenau, "The functioning of International Systems," *Background*, VII (November, 1963).

The general concept of an international system, forms the framework of many current studies in the field of international relations "Almost all of Karl W Deutsch's writing," for example, "has been oriented by the theory of systems and by system analysis techniques"[4] The same orientation is manifest in Raymond Aron's *tour de force Peace and War A theory of International Relations*[5] As Aron observed, there "has never been an international system including the whole of the planet", but the postwar period, when "for the first time humanity is living one and the same history," has witnessed the emergence of a kind of global system[6] It is characterized by great heterogeneity

In the words of Stanley Hoffmann "An international system is a pattern of relations between the basic units of world politics, which is characterized by the scope of the objectives pursued by these units and of the tasks performed among them, as well as by the means used in order to achieve those goals and perform those tasks"[7]

Morton Kaplan, suggests that six international systems may be identified the balance of power, the loose bipolar, the tight bipolar, the universal, the hierarchical, and the unit veto systems, ranging in degree of integration from the unit veto to the hierarchical[8] This classification has been a central theme in the discussion of system theory and classification, it has also provoked strong criticism

International Sub-system

Other studies have developed the idea of international sub-systems and subordinate state systems, usually related to geographical regions Michael Hass has identified and discussed twenty international sub-systems, ten in Europe (divided chronologically from 1649 to 1963), six in Asia (covering the years 1689 to 1964), and five in Hawaii (between 1738 and 1898)[9] In one of the best-known studies of international systems, Richard Rosencrance has devoted an entire volume to nine European

---

4 Charles A McClelland, *Theory and the International System* New York The Macmillan Company, 1966

5 Raymond Aron, *Peace and War A Theory of International Relations* Garden City, N Y, Doubleday & Company, 1966

6 *Ibid.* pp 162, 371, 374, 381

7 Stanley Hoffmann, "International Systems and International Law," *World Politics* XIV (October, 1961), 207

8 Morton Kaplan, *System and Process in International Politics*, New York John Wiley & Sons, 1957

9 Michael Haas, International Conflict A Prolegomenon to Peace Research *(Unpublished manuscript)*, p 103

sub-systems, over the period 1740 to 1960.[10] Michael Brecher has looked at Southern Asia as a "subordinate state system."

International system came into existence with the emergence of the modern European State systems. State system existed in the earlier period. But these systems were limited to certain well defined areas like Greece, Italy, China and India. A universal system was absent.

Different Meanings of the System

Scholars have assigned different meanings to the concept of system. It has been used in different senses.

1. **Arrangements.** The system is described as an arrangement of international actors in which interactions could be identified. According to James N. Rosenau "a system is considered to exist in an environment and to be composed of parts which through interaction are in relation to each other." The use of the term in this sense is made to describe the pattern of action among international actors. It does not possess much of theoretical value.

2. **Explanation.** As explanation system is referred to as a particular arrangement in which the nature of the arrangement itself is considered the most important variable in explaining the behaviour of states. In this sense the term is used to convey that the world is divided into a number of rational entities possessed of sovereignty which affect the nature of international relations. With no system of law enforceable among these sovereign states, conflicts leading to war are bound to occur, Kenneth Waltz, Kenneth Boulding and Charles McClelland have used the concept in this sense.

3. **Application.** System is used in the sense of application of special types of approaches (methods) to the study of international politics. In this third sense, system is the application of special types of approaches to the study of international relations.

4. **Method.** The system as method refers to particular approach adopted for bringing about a theoretical order in the vast data of international politics or relations. The system is used as a tool of analysis and focus upon arrangement of actors, interaction of actors or recurring pattern of individual behaviour. This system analysis in terms of method views international politics as a system in the meaning of 'system as explanation'. It means that there can be no use of system as method without prior commitment of certain assumptions. Therefore, it is necessary that there should be complete awareness of all the premises, e.g., ideological preferences which involve assumptions about the influence of values on human behaviour.

MORTON KAPLAN'S SYSTEM THEORY

The system theory or general systems theory was first expounded by McClelland in 1955 Later it was developed by many other scholars However, this theory was presented in a most systematic manner by Morton Kaplan He declared that systems approach provides the only possible method which can ensure the development of scientific politics He opined that there is some coherence, regularity and order in international relations International relations or politics implies two things 'International system' and 'nation state system' A nation state system is political system in the strict sense of the term *International system is not in fact a real political system*

Physical force is necessary to keep the system intact. This force is present in the state system It is absent in the case of international system Nations or *states are the main actors in the international politics The role of the states* changes with the change of international system Kaplan treats six models of major international system—the balance of power system, the loose bipolar system, the tight bipolar system, the universal international system, the hierarchical international system and the unit veto system

1 The Balance of Power System This system prevailed in Europe in *the 18th and 19th Centuries The system worked well for two centuries but* since the beginning of the 20th century these rules are not operating well It implied a sort of equilibrium of political power favourable to a particular nation at a particular time Theoretically, it meant even distribution of power between various nations to prevent any particular nation from imposing its will upon others The operation of this system involved six important rules (1) Each State may increase its power without war, i e, through negotiations, (2) The primary object of each state is to protect its national interests even at the risk of war; (3) One should not eliminate an essential national actor, (4) The national actor should prevent others from forming a coalition and disturbing the *international system, (5) The national* actor should prevent other actors from subscribing to supernational principles, (6) Defeated actor should be permitted re-entry into the system

2 The Loose Bipolar System The balance of power may *transform itself* into loose bipolar system In this system each bloc has a leading actor But supernational actors as well as national actors participate in the loose bipolar *system Supernational actors are divided into bloc actors* like NATO and Warsaw Bloc and universal actors like United Nations Loose bipolar system is characterised by two bloc actors (USA and USSR) non member bloc actors (non-aligned states) and universal actor (U N) All of these perform a unique and distinctive role within the system But the rules of the system are not uniform for all the actors The loose bipolar system has a considerable degree of inherent instability because the actors, or the non-member actors or the universal actor is rarely of decisive importance in the matter of policy formulation

3. The Tight Bipolar System. The loose bipolar system may be transformed either into a number of other systems or else into a tight bipolar system. In this system non-aligned states or non-member national actors either disappear or have little importance. Even universal actor is not in a position to mediate between the two bloc actors. After the disappearance of the uncommitted national actors the universal actor will not have sufficiently wide frame of reference.

4. The Universal International System. This system could be equated to World Federation. It would be possible when the United Nations or such other international agency becomes sufficiently strong to check war and maintain perpetual peace and the bipolar system would cease to exist. It would perform judicial, economic, political and administrative functions. However, the nation state would be left with sufficient autonomy.

5. The Hierarchical International System. This is another utopian model. It may come into existence when a universal actor absorbs the whole world and only one nation is left as the universal actor in this system rather remaining *sovereign, independent, political units. The system would be directive if found* by world conquest. It would be non-directive when power would be distributed among units according to hierarchy under the domination of a single national actor. The non-directive system would be based on will while the directive system will be based on force.

6. The Unit Veto System. In this system all states would have equal potentialities to destroy each other. Each state would possess the weapons for others' destruction. The unit veto system would remain stable only if all the actors are prepared to resist threats and retaliate in case of an attack.

Criticism of Kaplan's Theory

Though Kaplan's theory has relevance to the present international system, yet it has been subjected to severe criticisms :

1. Limited Possibilities. It is pointed out that while the first two systems in the scheme of Kaplan belong to realm of the actual, the third system is losing its possibility, as there is a growing trend in favour of stability and non-aligned nations, and dissensions in the bipolar system. Regarding the fourth, we find that a partial international system is growing. The fifth system has no possibility of being realised. The emergence of the sixth system is very doubtful in the wake of the non-proliferation treaty.

2. Limited Merit. The six model scheme of international system has only limited merit.

3. Neglect of Value Dynamics. Any theory of behaviour of state must deal with the dynamics of value formation. Kaplan does not discuss this dynamics of the forces which determine the scale of nations behaviour. The study of international relations in terms of international system is the study of the behaviour of states as units.

4 National Interests Kaplan devotes attention to the concepts of national interests He concedes that it cannot be separated from national values But he has ignored how nation's interest and national values are formed and how they affect the collective behaviour of state He overlooks the facts that the concept of national interest has already undergone a change In order to control the international system and transform it in accordance with the demands of peace one will have to know the source through which the international system mostly changes

DECISION MAKING APPROACH

Another approach for the study of international politics which has been developed during the past few decades in the decision making approach It is associated with the names of Richard C Synder, H W Bruck and Borton Spain These writers tried to provide a theoretical explanation of the behaviour of the actors in international relations They tried to find out as to why and how do the actors behave

What is decision making ?

"*Decision making is a process or a sequence of activities involving* stages of problem recognition, search or information, definition of alternatives consistent with the ranked preferences identified in the first three stages that will maximise or satisfy the actors goals " The object of the decision making approach is to devise a conceptual framework that could help us in the reconstruction of the situation as defined by the decision makers The facts and data for our study should be selected on the basis of what explains the behaviour of decision makers The setting in which the foreign policy decisions are made is the one which is perceived by the decision makers It consists of internal and external parts The internal settings include domestic politics, public opinions, personalities and organisations The external setting involves all the relevant factors in the total situation of the international system existing at a particular time, e g , the factors beyond the territorial boundaries of the state, the decision of other states and the nature of their society

Lines of Decision making Approach

Different lines have been followed by the theorists of this approach Each has laid emphasis on the following different factors

1. Environmental Factors The *first line* places emphasis on environmental factors which mean how the environment influence the decision-making The environment has tow aspects one, which the decision makers can see and the other which is beyond their perception or estimate This aspect was emphasized by Harold Sprout and Margaret Sprout They asserted that decision making ' is a process which results in the selection from a socially *defined, limited number* of problematical, alternative

projects of which one project intended to bring about the particular future state of affairs envisaged by the decision-makers."

2. Personality Factors. The *second line* includes the personality factor. It seeks to study the behaviour of the decision makers by studying their personality. This can be helpful in explaining things at least so long as the same decision makers continue to control the foreign policy. Alexander George and Juliette George emphasised the important role played by President Wilson in the determination of international relations during his presidency.

3. Participating Actors. *Third line* of approach is related to a study of those actors who actually participate in the formulation of foreign policy. There are at least five elements which influence the foreign policy making: the public opinion, interests groups, the media of mass communication, specific agents in the executive branch and specific committees of a legislature. James Robinson says that 'the organisation and internal process of the legislature determines the actual foreign policy.'

The above three lines indicate that the basic idea of the decision making approach is that international politics should be taken as the interaction of foreign policies. The only useful approach for the understan - ding of the interaction can be to study it in the context of foreign policy decisions.

GAME THEORY

International politics has been often described as a "game", in which the rules, are often changed and sometimes openly violated. Game theory attempts to provide models for studying world politics. A common version is the so-called zero-sum game, in which one party loses what the other wins. A more appropriate model in international relations, is the multiparty non-zero-sum game. As J.K. Zawodny says "We must recognize that some types of international conflict today can be resolved only by situations in which neither side loses and in which sometimes both sides may win."[11] The applicability of this observation to international negotiations and to crises in contemporary international relations is obvious.

Game theory owes much to the seminal work of John Von Neumann and Oskar Morgenstern, *The Theory of Games and Economic Behaviour.*[12] It expounded "the mathematics of probability and of decisional sequences"

---

11. Z.K. Zawodny, ed., *Man and International Relations* (Son Francisco : Chandler Publishing Co., 1967), II, 699.
12. Oskar Morgenstern, *The Theory of Games and Economic Relations*, 2nd ed. (Princeton, N.J. : Princeton University Press, 1947).

under "conditions of incomplete information"[13] In international relations, it is often used as a basis of theoretical and applied analysis[14] But, as Morton Kaplan points out, 'it has only limited applicability to most problems of international politics'[15] As Karl W Deutsch suggests "Game theory usually assumes that most games have an end but international politics resembles *rather an unending game in which no great power can pick up its marbles* and go home'[16]

Communications Theory

Communications theory attempts to emphasise the revolution in communications which has profoundly changed the nature of human contacts and social relations, in all parts of the world "The 20th century breakthrough in communications ranks with the great forces which have shaped mankind's progress through history Its impact on human behaviour and on world affairs already exceeds that of the atom bomb In the relatively brief span of four decades, modern communications technology has changed the way of life of the development societies, rent centuries old customs and traditions in the developing ones, and substantially altered the relationships between the two In spite of these far reaching changes, it appears certain that we stand merely at the threshold of a world transformed by electronics, a world in which further developments in communications will magnify both our opportunities for progress and our problems"[17]

In international relations, the great advances in communications are bound to have profound consequences, for good or for ill They provide the instruments and the techniques for the transmission of information and ideas, of skills and technology, and for closer contacts among peoples, within as well as between nations They are useful for the promotion of education and propaganda, national objectives and international cooperation, economic, social, and political development, and also, unfortunately, political regimentation and control Agencies for political recruitment, mobilization, and socialization, such as political parties, may be analyzed in terms of communications theory

---

13 Deutsch, *The Nerves of Government* p 53

14 Two outstanding examples are Thomas C Schelling *The Strategy of Conflict* (Cambridge Mass Harvard Press, 1960), and Anatole Rapoport, *Fights Games and Debats* (Ann Arbore University of Michigan Press, 1960)

15 "The New Great Debate Traditionalism vs Science in International Relations" *World Politics* XIX (October, 1966) 14

16 Deutsch, *The Nerves of Government* p 69

17 *Modern Communications and Foreign Policy* (Washington, D C. Government Printing Office, 1967) pp 1R, 2R

To quote Charles A. McClelland, "three areas of international relations" which "appear to be particularly amenable to consideration from the standpoint of communications" are cross-cultural relations, public opinion and attitudes, and decision-making processes in the area of "statecraft."[18] In the words of Haas, "Communications theorists deal less with the structural or gaming aspects of statements and behaviour than with the gross flow of goods, persons, and messages across territorial boundaries. By constructing maps of mail flow, airline traffic, trade, exchange of diplomats, and other instances of state interaction one can observe communications models, clusters, and isolates."[19] Communications should be considered both in theory as well as in application, in accordance with the end which are sought and the values which are held as well as with the media and techniques that are available at a given time.

1. Power. When E.H. Carr wrote his classic work, *The Twenty Years' Crisis,* first published in 1939, his "deliberate aim" was to counteract "the glaring and dangerous defect of nearly all thinking...about international politics in English-speaking countries from 1919 to 1939—the almost total neglect of the factor of power." After World War II, it has become the central theme in the study of international relations. It has practical as well as theoretical relevance. Power seems to be a major determinant of the policies of the leading states of the world and of international relations generally. The concept of power has been widened by research in various disciplines. At the same time its limitations are also being more generally recognized. As applied to the study of international relations the emphasis is on such old concepts as the balance of power, elements of national power, and the power equation in its practical application to international politics.

2. International Institutions and Organisations. The existence of the United Nations, and regional arrangements such as NATO and the OAS, and other organizations of an international or regional character has insured the continued popularity of the institutional emphasis. The institutional approach, if broadly conceived, opens up many promising avenues, especially if it includes the nation-states, the main "actors" in the world community, and if it emphasizes process as well as frameworks.

3. International Systems. A more sophisticated approach, is to study international relations in terms of international systems. It involves the elaboration of system theory or theories that may be applied to a wide variety of international phenomena, as well as the development of typologies of systems in the international community. International systems may be

---

18. Charles A. McClelland, *Theory and the International System,* pp. 120-36.
19. Haas, "*International Relations Theory,*" p. 31. See Karl W. Deutsch, *Nationalism and Social Communication* (Cambridge, Mass.: The M.I.T. Press, 1953).

studied historically or from the point of view of contemporary world politics Ancient China, classical Greece, imperial Rome, Renaissance Italy, Mughal India, or nineteenth-century Europe may be considered as international systems Contemporary international systems may be *constructed on the basis of* concepts of bipolarity or multipolarity or other versions of polarity, or of regions, such as continents or geographic areas of greater or lesser extent Different regions are often considered as international sub-systems or as subordinate state systems

4. Integration and the Community Approach. Integration is one of the central themes in the interdisciplinary approach to international relations A functioning international system requires a high degree of integration It is most effective if it is undergirded by a supporting community structure Studies of past and present tendencies towards integration as well as towards conflict in the international community may suggest factors that have an important bearing on contemporary diplomacy and political behaviour. Karl W Deutsch, Amitai Etzioni, and Ernst Haas, and groups of scholars in cooperative projects have analyzed experiments in successful and unsuccessful, past and contemporary integration Deutsch concluded that "most cases of successful integration occurred in the premodern era"[20] Etzioni believes "that conditions are ripest in modern times for the formation of transnational structures, inasmuch as a higher level of economic, political and administrative skill is attainable"[21] The theme of integration in the international community merits thoughtful study

5. Conflict, Conflict Management, and Conflict Resolution. International relations are concerned with conflict, its management and resolution The contributions of the behavioural sciences and of quantitative methods of analysis have been particularly fruitful in these vital areas One *major collection of readings, featuring contributions from psychology and* other behavioural sciences, takes integration and conflict as the two guiding concepts and considers conflict on three levels Interpersonal conflict, interpersonal and intergroup conflict, and nation-state conflict[22] Thomas Schelling draws upon game theory and other quantitative techniques in analyzing *The Strategy of Conflict* A useful periodical in the field of international relations is entitled *The Journal of Conflict Resolution* Conflict management embraces a multitude of techniques for the control of international conflicts It is closely related to crisis management, which

---

20 Karl W Deutsch, *Nationalism and Social Communication* (New York · John Wiley & Sons, 1953)

21. Michael Haas, *Approaches to the Analysis of Systemic Factors*, p 24

22 Zawodny, ed , *Man and International Relations* Vol I . Conflict, Vol II Integration

Alastair Buchan has called "the new diplomacy" and for which Herman Kahn has identified no fewer than 44 separate measures which may be taken in response to a crisis situation.[23]

6. War and Peace. Almost all issues and studies in international relations directly or indirectly lead to questions of war and peace. The study of international relations is one of the most vital of all human endeavours. It calls for interdisciplinary research of the most sophisticated kind.

War has been a recurrent phenomenon throughout human history. Even in the present nuclear age, few years have been free of war in some parts of the world. However fearful the prospects may be conceivable methods of preventing World War III, and of limiting, if not preventing, lesser armed conflicts have been examined and have found ardent supporters.

Some 1400 peace organisations are devoted to research or activities relating to problems of war and peace.[24] These include well-established organisations such as the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace and small movements such as the International Peace Research Society, the Committee to Study the Organisation of Peace, the Institute for International Order, the Fund for Education Concerning World Peace Through World Law, and the World Peace Through World Law Institute at Duke University. Several journals, such as *Current Thought on Peace and War*, publish the results of recent studies in the field.

7. Ideologies. At the present time much of international relations centres on ideological issues which complicate and obstruct efforts to emphasize long-range problems and needs. Many commentators have pointed to the difficulty of identifying the ideological components in today's international tensions and crises, but the ideological elements in current world crises cannot be overlooked.

8. Nationalism. Nationalism is one of the most powerful forces in the world today, especially in non-Western countries and areas. It helps to explain the sensitivity of leaders and peoples of former colonies to any infringements, on their newly won independence.

9. Imperialism and Colonialism. Imperialism and Colonialism survive today in many parts of the world. Moreover, new forms of imperialism are appearing. One is Communist imperialism; another is the economic and cultural predominance of major powers described as "neo-imperialism."

---

23. Alastair Buchan, *Crisis Management—The New Diplomacy* (Paris, 1966); Herman Kahn, *On Escalation* (New York : Frederick A. Praeger, 1965).
24. *International Peace/Disarmament Directory*, 3rd ed. (Yellow Springs, Ohio : Lloyd Wilkie Publisher, 1963).

10. The National Interest In recent years, a major school of historians and students of world affairs has emphasized the concept of national interest as a central theme for the conduct of national policies The leaders of every nation are expected to promote the national interest Much of the controversy in the United States over American policies in Vietnam centered around fundamentally divergent views of what constituted the national interest in this difficult situation *This theme may be useful in assessing the history and conduct* of a nation's foreign policy

11. Decision-Making and Policy Formation. This approach is a counterweight to excessive concern with the institutional aspects of international relations It is particularly popular in the United States, where increasing attention is being given to the decision-making and governmental processes[25] *It offers a useful method for getting behind the surface of the policies of* nation-states or international agencies Decisions are made at various levels and in different ways in different political and international systems A study of the total political process, on a national, international, or comparative basis, provides a broader setting for a detailed analysis of decision making and policy formation

265244

12. *National Character.* *This approach illustrates the possibilities* of a broad based analysis of the distinctive attributes of peoples and social groups that compose the national units of modern international society Despite a lack of precise and reliable tests and standards, useful work is being done in studying national character by various techniques These have been employed by seasoned writers and observers such as Alexis de Tocqueville and social and cultural anthropologists such as Geoffrey Gorer, Ruth Benedict, and Margaret Mead

13. Political and International Behaviour. Studies of political behaviour have thrown light on national character and other aspects of national motivation and response These studies represent a useful extension of research in individual and small-group behaviour to the national and international arena This new interest in interdisciplinary research and in the applications of the behavioural sciences to international problems has prompted Herbert C Kelman to suggest that "a new discipline seems to be emerging—the social psychology of international affairs"[26]

14. Political-Strategic Studies Many studies in the international relations give special attention to political-strategic approaches and analyses

---

25 Richard C Snyder H H Bruck, and Burton Sapin, *Foreign Policy Decision Making An Approach to the Study of International Politics* (New York The Free Press of Glencoe, 1962)

26 Herbert C Kelman ed, *International Behaviour A Social Psychological Analysis* (New York Holt, Rinehart & Winston 1965) p vii

Many research institutes are devoted to these subjects, such as the Rand Corporation, the Hudson Institute, the Institute of War and Peace Research at Columbia University, the Foreign Policy Research Institute at the University of Pennsylvania, and the Institute of Strategic Studies in London.

15. Alliance Systems and Alliance Politics. Even though most of the major multilateral alliances, including NATO, the Warsaw Pact, SEATO, and CENTO, and have lost much of their original purpose and momentum, the politics of NATO and other alliance systems remains an important new dimension in the study of contemporary international relations.

16. Arms Control and Disarmament. The Disarmament Commission of the United Nations, the General Assembly itself, and the Eighteen Nation Disarmament Committee at Geneva have conducted lengthy deliberations on these subjects. The United States has a large Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, a semi-autonomous agency within the Department of State. Besides, many other governments have similar agencies.

The International Atomic Energy Agency and most governments are deeply concerned with questions of the peaceful uses of atomic energy. There is a vast documentation and a great deal of scholarly research and practical investigation on all of these matters.

17. Demographic Studies. Many observers believe that the two most pressing questions in the world today are those of food and people. The population explosion is one of the most significant phenomena of the contemporary world. Population control is of paramount importance today and in the immediate future. The United Nations, its Population Commission, and some of its specialized agencies and an increasing number of scholars, policy-makers, and informed citizens in many lands, are actively concerned with this question. Centres and programmes of demographic studies exist in many countries. Large and small, official and unofficial conferences discuss population problems and their possible solution. Demographic factors must be studied in any study in international relations.

18. Economic Factors. No students of international affairs can afford to neglect the theory and the practice of international and comparative economics individual subject as economic planning and development, rates of exchange, tariffs, exchange controls, commodity agreements, international trade, balance of payments, foreign aid, disparities between developed and under-developed economies, international investment, international économic agencies such as the World Bank and International Monetary Fund, and many other UN-affiliated agencies and regional economic agencies.

CONFLICTING TRENDS

Among the conflicting trends which confront and confuse the student of international relations are the following

1. Objectivity—Subjectivity. "The Problems of international relations," observes Quincy Wright, "usually concern the divergence of the subjective truths accepted by different societies and regarded by each to be objective truth "[27]

2. Realism—Idealism The issue of realism *versus* idealism has a continuing application to international problems Much of the difference of opinion on current issues of foreign policy or of national behaviour centres on this dilemma

3. Nationalism—Internationalism. Nationalism is still a major factor *in the contemporary world, especially among peoples who have recently won* political independence While nationalism may become an ever more anomalous phenomenon, internationalism may represent the "wave of the future " Perhaps, as Leslie Lipson has contended, "modern internationalism is a reaction to the declining adequacy of nationalism "[28]

4. National Security—International Cooperation. As long as the nation-state system is the prevailing form of political organization, the emphasis must continue to be on national security rather than on international cooperation No major nation can afford to gamble its national security on the assumption that all nations will cooperate in their own self-interest The presence of powerful states or groups of states which seem be willing to cooperate only on their own terms, threaten the peace and ir _ of other nations

5. Force—Consent. It is difficult to ascertain the relative importance *of force and consent in international conduct Even the most peace-loving* state has to mix the two Democratic states must seek as wide an era of agreement and of consent as possible, but they can not avoid the use of force

6. Cooperation—Conflict Innumerable instances the respective roles of cooperation and conflict in international affairs occur daily Examples of conflict involve basic questions of war and peace and of national and human survival But cooperation is more common than conflict, and the opportunities for *promoting it are being constantly explored* The findings in psychology and psychiatry and other branches of the behavioural sciences have thrown new light on the causes of cooperation and conflict in international affairs as well as in individual and group behaviour

27 Quincy Wright, *The Study of International Relations* (New York Appleton Century-Crofts, 1955) p 20

28 *The Great Issues of Polit cs* (Englewood Cliffs, N J Prentice-Hall 1954) p 351

7. Collectivism—Individualism. The trend toward collectivism has been in keeping with the prevailing patterns of human society in most parts of the world at most periods of history. In relatively modern times the individual *qua* individual has been the focus of national and international policy. Brought up on the principles of the rights of man and the importance of the individual Americans, have difficulty in understanding other societies where the emphasis has been upon the group and upon the subordination of individuals in the mass to the interest of the favoured few.

Arnold Toynbee has suggested that in attempting to appeal to peoples in non-Western societies, the West should emphasize spiritual rather than material factors. "We should put our main stress on the West's respect for individual freedom. That has universal appeal."[29]

8. Plenty—Want. "This planet of ours," wrote L.Bruckberger, "is like a nightmare ocean liner. In the first-class, a few well-fed passengers live luxuriously in spacious quarters, while on the decks and in the holds all the rest of the passengers are herded together in hunger and misery. Who can fail to see the dynamite in this situation ? The ocean liner is one world, but a unified world does not necessarily mean a world at peace. It is only too obvious that the people on the decks and in the holds could mutiny, and by the weight of numbers could easily overwhelm and enslave the first-class passengers. Our world is that ocean-going liner, headed toward an unknown destiny common to all on board."[30] A substantial improvement in the life conditions of the majority of mankind is a prerequisite for a peaceful world.

9. Humanity—Inhumanity. Toynbee predicted that the twentieth century will be remembered longest because for the first time in history the welfare of the whole human race became an object of international policy. Unfortunately the twentieth century has also witnessed brutalization of the human spirit and some of the worst examples of man's inhumanity to man.

10. The promise of an Unprecedented era of Human Progress. The danger of mass annihilation. Mankind has come to a stage where for the first time "power without limit" seems to be attainable. Inherent in the limitless possibilities of the atomic age are limitless dangers. This is the greatest paradox of this age of paradoxes.

The study of international relations is not a science with which one may solve the problems of international life. It is only an objective and systematic approach to those problems. Students of international relations must always strive for objectivity, balance, and perspective. They must carry on their work

---

29. Press conference in New York, reported in the *New York Times,* November 4, 1954.
30. R.L. Bruckberger, *Image of America* (New York : The Viking Press, 1959), pp. 271, 272.

in the face of obstacles of prejudice, ignorance, emotionalism, and vested interest often including their own They must beware of "simple" solutions to complex problems They must also shun the thesis of the "inevitability" of war, the "wave of the future" approach, and all such encouragements to disaster They must keep their eyes on the world as it should be, but they must never mistake the ideal for the actual, or conclude that what "must" be will in fact occur

QUESTIONS FOR EXERCISE

1 What is the meaning of approach Describe and distinguish Classical and Scientific approach to international relations

2 Give a critical assessment of the Realist Approach to international relation and politics

3 Distinguish the Idealist v/s Realist Approach to international relations

4 Discuss Classicist-Behaviouralists Controversy and outline defence in each case

5 Critically discuss the Systems Theory Particularly that of Morton Kaplan

6 Write short note on Decision Making Approach

4

National Power : Value and Elements

ELEMENTS OF NATIONAL POWER

The power of a state depends on numerous elements and relative factors. The elements of power are not constant. These are undergoing changes due to natural and technical causes. Therefore, the power of a state can be only tentatively measured. The chief factors or elements which determine the power of a state are as follows :

1. Geography

(i) Location. Napoleon used to say that "the foreign policy of a country is determined by its geography". Thus geography provides a stable elements of national power in any state. The location of state determines whether it develops naval power or land power. The insular and peninsular states like U.S.A., U.K. and Japan emerge as maritime powers. On the other hand, the landlocked states like Czechoslovakia, Nepal and Switzerland develop another type of policy viz., dependence on neighbour states for an outlet into the sea.

(ii) Neighbours. The immediate neighbours also determine the power of a state. Buffer states are often forced to be neutral. States located very close to big powers are influenced by the policy of the neighbouring country. If a country is strategically important, it becomes a centre of big-power politics as Egypt.

(iii) Size. The size of a country also determines the power status of a nation. A large size is particularly helpful in the rise and development of a Great Power, as in the China. On the other hand, a small sized state cannot become a Great Power, because of its limited capacity and resources.

(iv) Shape. The shape of the territory of a country has also its impact on a state's position. A compact territory helps in internal communication as well as in protection of frontiers. These advantages are missing in a country with a broken territory like Pakistan and Greece.

(v) Climate Climate of a country also plays an important part in the power status of a nation. If the climate is very cold or very dry it will generally lead

to sparce population resulting in meagre exploitation of resources The intermediate type of climate which is neither too cold nor too dry is most suitable for the development of national power The states located in such climatic zones have generally been the most powerful states To quote Prof Hartmann "From the point of view of human activity, the temperate zone between 20 and 60 degrees north and 20 and 60 degrees south are the most favourable for human activity"

(vi) Fertility. The climate determines the fertility of the soil If the rainfall is uncertain and periodically there are droughts, as in India Here the development of national power is automatically limited As the country has to depend for food on foreign aid, it obstructs the development of national power and adoption of an independent foreign policy

2. Population

(i) Large Number. Population is another important determinant of national power Usually large population is considered a source of strength But Palmer and Perkins hold that large populations can both be a source of weakness or a source of strength The say, "The test is whether a state can utilize its human resources effectively, can support them at tolerable standards of living, and can provide constructive outlets for their talents and energies" Usually large numbers are a source of strength in the developed countries, whereas, in underdeveloped countries, they are a source of weakness Thus large population by itself does not add to the power of the state But it cannot be denied that the proper utilisation of the population can add to the strength of a nation Large population may help in increasing agricultural and manufacturing production By providing a consumer market it stimulates national productivity Population provides sufficient number of armed personnel as well as for replacement during war Even after war, a large population is essential to occupy the conquered territories Nazi Germany found it difficult to keep the occupied European territories under her control, because of her limited man-power resources On the other hand, a number of states with small population such as U K and France have been able to emerge as big powers, because they succeeded in adding to their demographic power by colonial expansion. Their colonial possessions were many times more than their own area and size

This quantity of population alone cannot contribute to the national strength If the large population cannot be maintained by the existing resources of a country, it becomes more a handicap than an asset in the development of national power The case of India is a glaring example If a country does not possess sufficient capital and technical know-how, the large population can become a liability In spite of their large populations the Middle Eastern and South American countries were forced to open up their lands to the American and European investors because they lacked both capital and technical know-how

(ii) Age Composition. Apart from the number, the age composition of the population is very significant. If there are too many children or elderly people in a population, it means an additional strain on national economy and power. On the other hand, if there are more youths, they can render immense help in the national economy as well as the military power.

(iii) Occupation. There is close co-relationship between the population and the profession followed by them. The comparative strength of the population engaged in agriculture is relatively less than those engaged in non-agricultural activities.

(iv) Literacy. A state with higher rate of literacy is more powerful, because the people develop greater productive capacity. Emphasizing the importance of this factor, Madariaga says, that national power is "mostly due to technical capacity, ability, brain ability for organizing and leading human beings in the mastering and the controlling of the forces of nature. It is mostly attained through intellectual capacity for the physical, chemical and mathematical sciences, as well as in the sciences and practical arts of administration and government."

3. Resources

(i) Natural Resources. No country can develop an industrial base unless it possesses sufficient natural resources and raw materials. Natural resources are the gifts of nature and include most minerals, flora, fauna, fertility of soil, waterfall, etc. Raw materials, on the other hand, are not natural. They are produced by human labour and include things like rubber, hides, cotton, etc. The resources by themselves do not create power. These have to be exploited and their exploitation requires capital, technical know-how and skilled labour. For example the iron deposits in Brazil were useless until World War II, when they were exploited with the help of American loans and technical assistance. Further, the national strength of a country does not depend on one or two of natural resources but on a number of them.

(ii) Food Stuff. Of all the resources, food stuff is of prime importance. A country enjoying self-sufficiency in this direction is likely to be powerful. Both U.S.A. and U.S.S.R. are self-sufficient in this respect. Dependence on foreign food considerably weakens the international stature of a state.

(iii) Minerals. Apart from the food-stuffs minerals like coal, oil, iron, etc., are also vital for the national power.

(a) Coal. The abundance of coal in Britain provided the base for the industrial revolution in that country. Similarly coal deposits played an important part in the development of Western Europe.

(b) Oil. Oil is another important basic material of economic power U.S.A. possesses the richest oil deposits in the world.

(c) Gas and Atomic Energy In recent years natural gas and atomic energy have become other important sources of energy and national power

(d) Iron The iron ore, which forms the root of steel production and provides the key to all heavy and capital industries, is another important raw material Both U S A and U S S R are the chief producers of iron

(e) Other Raw Materials The other vital raw materials which contribute to power are aluminium, copper, manganese, rubber, tin, chromium, cobalt, uranium, nickel, gold and diamond These materials are also found mainly in advanced and bigger powers

4 Technology

Technology has been defined as 'applied science' of the new over the old It affects the power base of a state and also the entire courses of international politics Three areas of technological progress have particularly affected international relations, viz, industrial technology, communications and military technology

(i) Industrial technology. Industrial technology adds to the power of the country by creating economic surplus It can also set a country free from dependence on other countries for raw materials For example U S A discovered synthetic rubber as a substitute for raw rubber and got rid of the problems connected with import of rubber from South-East Asia With the discovery of nuclear energy it has been possible for the states to produce electricity even without rivers

(ii) Communication. Unprecedented growth in the various means of communication has made most significant effect on international relations by keeping nation in constant touch with each other The technological changes in the sphere of communication have improved the methods of transporting ideas, people and goods It has resulted in the progress of diplomacy Due to it the diplomat, as a negotiator, has become more dependent on the Foreign office The diplomacy has become more effective weapon

(iii) Military Technology. Technology in the military sphere has played most significant role Britain has been able to establish her vast colonial empire because of her superior military technology In subsequent years each advancement in military technology has given an advantageous power position to the states inventing new weapons

Military technological advances have greatly affected the foreign policies of various countries For example, U S A abandoned her policy of isolation since as a result of advances in military technology she became more vulnerable This technology has added to the power of nations and affected their foreign policy

5. Organisation

The organisation is the most important element of national power since ultimately it operates to convert a potential into a realised power. A country may have good location, plenty of natural and human resources, yet it may not be able to play an effective role in the international relations due to weak organisation.

(i) Pattern of Government. Organisation means the pattern of government. It cannot be said that a particular form of government is superior to the other. Democracy has been considered to be better than dictatorship because it is able to stand greater stressed and strains. It may impose greater discipline and persuade people to make greater sacrifice for the growth and development of the country.

(ii) Bureaucracy. The success of a political organisation depends on its bureaucracy. If the bureaucracy is honest, efficient and clean, it may be able to harness the national power effectively.

(iii) Economic Organisation. Economic Organisation implies 'the group of fundamental principles which govern the conditions of production and distribution'. Economic organisation may be based on socialism, state capitalism or communism. All these systems have their respective merits. From the point of view of power, the economic organisation must be characterised by efficiency of production. If there is surplus production, it adds to the capacity of the country to persuade other nations to its point of view, by giving them the temptation of aid, technical assistance and trade. If the other countries do not get tempted by these incentives, it may force them to its point of view by stopping financial aid and technical assistance as well as by raising tariff walls. At present U.S.A. is an example of such a country.

6. Leadership

Equally important is the leadership for national power since ultimately it alone utilises the organisation for the promotion of state power. Leadership is not merely political. In addition to the political leadership a nation requires wise diplomats abroad, able generals, naval captains, capable labour leaders, wise spokesmen of industry, finance, etc. However, it cannot be denied that the political leadership alone helps in fostering leadership at the other levels.

7. National Character

The national character is another important determinant of national power. It is mainly the product of history and social experience. For example, the British faith in compromise and negotiated settlement is the direct outcome of her commercial development and colonial policy. The French faith

in ideological issue is the outgrowth of French Revolution of 1789 and their fanatical zeal thereafter The German character of discipline and authoritarianism has an imprint of Bismarck The American pragmatism and informality are a product of the development of a young nation by settlers, who took a refuge from persecution and ceremonials The Russian tenacity reflects the cruelty of weather and Czarist despotism The Indian policy of non-alignment reflects the dominant Indian trait of detachment This detached character has been formed by the uncertainty of rainfall, colonial exploitation and starvation The anti-imperialist attitude of African countries is a product of long colonial exploitation by the western powers However, it would be too much to draw and conclusions on the basis of the character traits of certain countries because this factor is quite elusive Again, the national character keeps on changing and moulding itself from time to time

8. Morale

Morale of the people depends on whether a large percentage of citizens *are willing to subordinate their personal interests to the nation's welfare Such* sacrifice is required both during times of war and peace During the period of war people must be willing to lay down their lives for the nation's existence *During the time of peace they should be willing to make sacrifice to promote* economic development Thus the unity of population establishes superior morale If a country is wrecked by internal cleavages and dissensions it is *either not able to demonstrate any morale or if there is morale it is not of an* effective degree An ethnic minority living too close to the mother country raises even more complex problems For example, Germany under Hitler aroused the German minorities living in Czechoslovakia and demanded accession of that area to Germany

9. Military Element

The military element is an important factor in national power because ultimately all nations are forced to depend on its own system of security and power

(i) Quantity. The military element of national power depends both on the quantity and quality of its armed forces A country with a large number of armed personnel is generally more powerful In addition to the armed forces, there is also a practice of maintaining certain number of reservists These reservists are a substantial strength since they can be drawn into military service at a short notice in emergencies

(ii) Quality. From the point of view of quality the nature of morale of army and military leadership are of great help in the promotion of national power

(iii) Alliances. The military alliances and bases *constitute an important* aspect of military power A country with a number of such alliances and

military bases is more powerful than a country which has neither entered into alliances nor acquired military bases.

(iv) Arms and Ammunition. Another important aspect of military determinants of national power is the quality of arms and ammunitions. This to a large extent depends on the financial resources, industrial capacity as well as military research.

10. Ideology. Pedelford and Lincoln define ideology "as a body of ideas concerning economic, social and political values and goals each pose action programmes for attaining these goals." Ideology proceeds with certain assumptions about the nature of man. It builds up a theory of human history, a moral code of conduct, a sense of mission and a programme for action, It is an action system of ideas based on a definite view of the world. It gives unity to a nation. It gives a sense of common interest to people. It helps the government in finding support from the people. It serves as a good weapon to raise the morale of the people. The Ideology is closely linked with national power. Most of the ideologies are concerned with the achievement of power as the immediate goal of foreign policy by explaining and justifying it in ethical, legal and biological terms. They are also used as a cover to hide the real nature of the objective of a foreign policy. Ideology may be an effective instrument in forging unity among various states professing faith in similar ideologies. Thus it contributes to the enhancement of power. Due to common ideology, Germany, Italy and Japan forged an alliance against democratic countries during the inter-war period. However, ideology alone is not a binding factor as countries may form alliances even if they hold faith in different ideologies, if the national interest so demand. For example, USSR joined hands with USA, France and Britain, during second World War, and fought against fascist powers even though they believed in different ideologies. In recent years, Soviet Union and United States have come closer despite differences in their ideologies. The ideological barriers, which divided these two super powers since the close of the Second World War, have not started breaking up.

11. Diplomacy

According to Morgenthau it is the quality of a nations's diplomacy which gives 'direction and weight' to other elements of national power. A good diplomacy brings the different elements of national power to bear maximum effect upon those points in the international situation which have a direct bearing on the national interests. We may quote Morgenthau that diplomacy is the brain of national power, as national morale is its soul. If its vision is blurred, its judgment defective, and its determination feeble, all the advantages of geographical location, of self-sufficiency in food, raw materials, and industrial production, of military preparedness, of size and quality of population will, in the long run will be of little avail to a nation. A nation that can boast of all these advantages, but not of a diplomacy commensurate

with them, may achieve temporary successes through the sheer weight of its natural assets In the long run, it is likely to squander the natural assets *by activating them incompletely, haltingly and wastefully* for the nation's international objectives. However, this view of Morgenthau is not universally shared Some of the scholars hold that diplomacy has considerably lost its importance in recent years due to the development of rapid means of communications which have reduced the diplomats to the position of dignified clerks Again, the impact of public *opinion and the emergence of* open diplomacy has also greatly contributed to the reduction in importance of diplomacy Thus in our times diplomacy has suffered a setback due to *above noted factors However, it still* plays an important role in promoting the national interests Palmer and Perkins have rightly observed, "Diplomatic effectiveness, like military effectiveness, is a combination of various elements of national power Both of them are likely to be measured by the skill or genius of individuals An astute diplomacy often achieves success out of *proportion with state's power potential, just as brilliant general- ship may* win victories that upset all sober calculations One might conclude that diplomatic and military talents ought to be regarded as more or less distinct elements of national power"

EVALUATION OF NATIONAL POWER

1. Relativity of Power. The task of evaluation of power is difficult since so many tangible factors are involved in the measurement of a nation's *power The results of war do not provide an adequate criterion of power because* power in the war is not the only kind of power A nation powerful otherwise may be defeated in a war. A victorious nation is not necessarily a powerful nation. According to Prof. Morgenthau the nations commit three types of errors in evaluating their own power and the power of other nations, viz., the relativity of power, the permanency of a certain factor and the fallacy of the single factor The concept of power is always relative One of the most elementary and frequent errors committed by the states is that they neglect the relative character of power *and treat it in absolute terms If a particular* nation is powerful today it may become relatively weak tomorrow and some other nations may emerge powerful

2. Power is Changing It is wrong to assume that the factors of national power are permanent and immune from change On the other hand, these factors undergo *constant change Therefore, we should never view* of particular factor as the source of power of a nation in the dynamic, ever- changing character of the power relations between nations

3. Multiple Factors. The third typical error made in assessing the power of different nations is the undue weightage attached to a single factor such as militarism, geopolitics or nationalism *Geopolitics* is a pseudo-science treating the factor of geography an absolute factor that is supposed to determine the

power. Similar errors are committed when reliance is made upon the other single factors like militarism or even nationalism.

Thus the task of evaluation of power is not simple. Miscalculations can prove disastrous. Underestimation of one's own power and overestimation of that of other lead to policies of peace and *status quo.* Overestimation of one's own power and underestimation of that of other leads to policies of war.

LIMITATIONS ON NATIONAL POWER

The most important limitations on the national power are the balance of power; international morality; international public opinion; international law and the United Nations.

1. Balance of power. Balance of power means checking power with power. Like checks and balances in domestic politics, in the field of international politics also the power of one nation or a group of nations is used to prevent a particular nation from imposing its will upon others. The common patterns of balance of power are direct opposition and competition. In opposition, one state opposes the other state with a view to preserve *status quo.* In competition two nations compete with each other to establish control over the third nation. The common methods used to maintain the balance of power are 'divide and rule', compensations and acquisitions, armaments and interventions, alliances and counter alliances and buffer state formation.

2. International Morality. Power is a crude and unreliable method of limiting the aspiration for power on the international scene. If the struggle for power takes an independent course it resembles the Hobbesian 'state of war' and 'might would have been the right'. In the civilised world, however, the struggle for power cannot go unchecked. It is bound to lead to disruption of society and enslavement and extinction of the individual. Certain moral precepts have been put forward to preserve the society such as the 'statesmen and diplomats ought to take to heart in order to make relations between nations more peaceful and less anarchic, such as keeping of promises, trust in the others' word, fair dealing, respect for international law, protection of minorities, repudiations of war as an instrument of national policy, etc.' These limit the actions of statesmen and diplomats. They do not pursue certain ends and use certain means due to moral limitations. Thus norms of morality impose limitations on the use of power a country possesses to achieve the desired goals. All states are expected to observe universally accepted moral code of conduct. This universal code is international morality.

3. International Public Opinion. Another limitation on the power of a nation, which is more elusive and lacks analytical precision, is the concept of international public opinion. No nation can exercise power at its disposal to secure its selfish ends in violation of the world public opinion. According to

Morgenthau "World public opinion is obviously a public opinion that transcends national boundaries and that unites members of different nations in a consensus with regard to at least certain fundamental international issues" Thus the world public opinion effectively guards the interests of the humanity as a whole Whenever any government or nation executes a particular foreign policy which is against the interest of mankind, international opinion checks it

However, modern history testifies that the world public opinion had never acted as a deterrent against any state which insisted on following a particular policy The Italian attack against Ethiopia in 1936 and Russian suppression of Hungarian revolution in 1956 may be cited as examples, where the public opinion failed to restrain these powers This however, is one side of the picture Nations was formed as the result of the world public opinion Similarly, Woodrow Wilson's fourteen points, which were the basis of the peace talks at the end of the First World War were accepted by nearly the entire humanity regardless of national boundaries as principles for just and enduring peace settlement

4. International Law. As there are rules for the human conduct in all societies, similarly in the society of nations there exist moral and legal norms, for the regulation of the conduct of nations The sum total of these norms is known as International Law In the field of international relations, the execution of national policy for the fulfilment of the national interests requires the use of force The most common method of use of force is war or threat of war If each nation uses its power in unlimited terms against her neighbour or opponent the world society would come to an end There would be no peace or stability It would be a perpetual state of war Life become 'nasty, brutish and short' There would be no progress in the field of art or literature, science or technology Therefore, a code of conduct in the form of international law is necessary to limit the national power In the strict sense international law is not a law It has certain inherent deficiencies like the absence of a common law making, law enforcing or law adjudicating body Its implementation is dependent on the will of the states The implementation of these laws by consent or use of external force limit the scope of use of national power by any state Again, the international law permits the formation of arrangements called collective security by a group of nations to oppose collectively, a particular nation or another group of nations who jeopardise their independence Here also the object of international law is to impose such limits on the exercise of national power by virtue of which the international society remains intact

5. Disarmament. Efforts at disarmament through League and UN have limited the national power An effort has been made through various conventions to control the use of nuclear weapons which have the potentialities

to destroy the entire world. This has resulted in the curtailment of the national power.

6. International Organisations. The formation of international organisations like the League of Nations and the United Nations has restrained the power of the states. The objectives of the U.N. stipulate "to maintain internal peace and security and to that end to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats of peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of peace, and to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace." The states are expected to act in accordance with the principles laid down in the Charter. United Nations cannot intervene in the internal matters of any state except when they pose a threat to the peace, but it certainly acts as a check on the unfair and unlimited use of power by the States. Therefore, it is a limitation on national power.

QUESTIONS FOR EXERCISE

1. What is the value of National Power ? Discuss its elements.
2. What are the main components of National Power ? What role can leadership play in this context ?
3. Write a short essay on the elements of National Power.
4. Evaluate national power and point out its limitations.

5

Rise of Sovereign State Systems

VALUE OF SOVEREIGN STATE SYSTEM

The sovereign state is a dominant feature of the international relations It is one of the major actors on the international scene Today, the people all over the world are divided into a number of groups which live in sovereign states As Karl W Deutsch puts it, "Though the territorial state as a physical shell has been shattered by the force of modern nuclear physics, nothing has thus far shattered the loyalty of the people to their nation, and so long as this is true, the motives, conduct, policy and pattern of international relations will continue to be a function of the behaviour of sovereign states " These states maintain relations with each other out of sheer necessity No international *relations would have been possible if men were not organised into nations* and willing to obey their government's commands Some scholars have contended that the nation-style system is fast disappearing, on account of the growing interdependence of the people and the imperatives of the nuclear and space age It is becoming increasingly inadequate in the present context John Herz maintains that the technological revolution of post-war era has rendered the traditional states obsolete The state is no longer capable of safeguarding its citizens in the event of breakout of a war which involves nuclear, psychological and economic weapons Therefore, the present international system would be replaced by a system dominated by conflicting regional alliances As Robert Strausz Hupe said, "The passing of nation-state system constitutes the true *revolution of our times " This view has been refuted by a number of scholars* To quote Max Learner, "It is not the nation state that is dying, but its untrammelled sovereignty and the historic pattern of relations between nation states " *As* Palmer and Perkins assert, the state system "may be in its sunset period, but there seems to have been little change in its basic design, which is the co-existence of a large number of states, including some pre-eminent military powers, all subject to the drive of their special interests and emotions, all subscribing to the theory of sovereignty, and all impelled to develop national power as the instrument of their national policies " Emphasising the importance of states in international relations, Frankel points out that their discontinuance might destroy the stability of the international system as a whole and accentuate the *possibility of a war*

MEANING OF SOVEREIGN STATE SYSTEM

Defining nation state system Palmer said that the nation-state system "is the pattern of political life in which people are separately organised into sovereign states that interact with one another in varying degrees and in varying ways." These states are involved in conflict as well as co-operation. These nation states resort to methods of peaceful persuasion for the protection of their respective interests. When these fail they resort to coercive methods. Each state tries to build up its national power by organising its coercive resources.

ORIGIN OF SOVEREIGN STATE SYSTEM

Peace of Westphalia

Scholars have traced the origin of state system from the year 1648 when the Treaty of Westphalia was signed, which brought the thirty year war to an end. Even before that the states existed and entered into relations with each other. They were however, not sovereign states as their authority was restrained by the Roman Church and the Roman Empire. The peace of Westphalia paved the way for the emergence of the sovereign system by recognising that the Roman Empire did not command the allegiance of its parts and that the Pope cannot maintain his spiritual authority everywhere. Thus, the rulers of a number of European countries such as England, France, Germany, Spain, etc., shaked off the authority of the Pope in religious affairs and that of the Emperor of Rome in secular matters. Now the supreme authority was identified with the nation-state. Now each nation-state had the right to utilise the strength of the people and its resources as it liked. Though theoretically these states were equal they differed from each other in matters of real powers.

Factors of Development

In due course the state system underwent further development. This was due to the rise of representative government, industrial revolution, change in population, growth of international law, development of diplomacy, growing inter-dependence of the states in economic sphere. evolution of methods for peaceful settlement of disputes and the expansion of the state system to non-western World. The emergence of nationalism was the one factor which left most deep impact on the state system. It created a strong sense of attachment amongst the people towards the state.

Mass Involvement

An average citizen became more deeply involved in the political life of the country. It was no more possible for the statesmen to trade territories on the basis of ancient titles or strategic considerations. The only legitimate basis for the organisation of the state was the ethnic or linguistic affinity. Sovereign states like Russia, Austria-Hungary and Sweden-Norway faced nationalist insurrection. The movement for national independence gained momentum. Mass

involvement was also used by the governments for military and diplomatic bargaining States often mobilised the popular support in support of their diplomacy or wars Involvement of the common citizens imposed restrictions on the freedom of actions of government Hence while formulating their diplomacy even the most autocratic regimes had to take into account the public reaction

Development of Sophisticated War Techniques

In the nineteenth and the twentieth centuries, the development of sophisticated techniques of military warfare which involved extensive civilian mobilisation also affected the character of the sovereign state-system The states fought with a view to annihilating the enemy and imposing its political and social institutions upon the defeated nation

Rise of Ideology

The rise of ideology and political doctrines transformed the character of the sovereign state-system Earlier, the states were motivated by territorial objectives In the nineteenth century the conflicts were given ideological colour Most of the wars in Europe were fought in support of the principle of royal legitimacy against the radical French doctrines In the twentieth century wars were fought in support of or against a particular ideology such as Nazism, Communism and Liberal Democracy

Extension of European state-system

A notable change took place in the nature of state system towards the close of the nineteenth century even though its implications became clear only in the present century It was the extension of the European state system to the rest of the world and the emergence of new political units in Asia, Africa and Latin America Thus the state-system extended to the whole of the world Now there are more than 160 nation-states

Modern State System

Pointing out the fundamental similarity between modern nation-state system and the state-system of the nineteenth century Prof Holsti observed "Despite the great variety of cultural contexts in which relations between states occur today, some important characteristics of the system represent merely an extension into new areas of the diplomatic, economic, ideological and military traditions of the Europeans What sets off the contemporary international system from its European predecessors is the rise in number of states, great capacity for destruction, vulnerability of states to destruction and subversion and predominant position of influence that has been achieved by three essentially non-European states, the Soviet Union, Communist China, and the United States"

SALIENT FEATURES OF MODERN NATION-STATE

1. Sovereignty. Sovereignty implies that the governments are the supreme law making authorities in their respective territories. It was first established by the Treaty of Westphalia. It provided that only sovereign states could enter treaty relations with each other. A political unit which lacked sovereignty could not become a legal unit. It could not conclude treaties with other states. It could not become member of international organisation. It could not claim any other rights available to the sovereign states under international law. A political unit lacking sovereignty has no legal standing among other states. As Palmer and Perkins rightly observed sovereignty "gives the state unique and virtually unlimited authority in all domestic matters and in relation to other states". A sovereign state has a right to govern the territory under its control as it deems necessary. There is no external restriction on its authority, except the one which it might have accepted under some treaty. In the international context, sovereignty would imply right of self-government and promotion of nation's interests through independent foreign policy. The states have to make several compromises and adjustments with other nations for the promotion of their national interests. This naturally restricts their absolute sovereignty. The concept of state sovereignty in international relations means the equality of all nations, big or small, great powers or small powers. Clyde Eagleton points out "Sovereignty cannot be an absolute term. It is just as foolish to say that sovereignty must be surrendered or eliminated as to say that it must be absolute and unrestrained." However, it cannot be denied that "So long as the nation state system remains the basis of the prevailing pattern of international society, the substance of society will remain."

2. Territory Integrity. A nation-state system must have territorial integrity. This is a logical corollary of the first. A sovereign state does not like outside interference in its affairs. It must also abstain from interference in the internal affairs of other states. The states may influence the behaviour of each other through established diplomatic channels. They must respect each other's territorial integrity.

3. Legal Equality. Irrespective of their size, population, military capabilities, economic resources, etc., nation states are equal members of the international community. The principle of "equal rights of all the nations large and small" has been accepted by the UN Charter. This principle of equality of different independent states was recognised at the same time when the nation-states made their appearance. Classical writers of the eighteenth century such as Pufendorf and Vattel also endorsed the principle of equality of states. Vattel argued that "all powers in the state of nature are equal, the persons of international law are in a state of nature, therefore, they are equal." The principle of equality was challenged by positivists in the

nineteenth century They argued that to assert that a "state with the thousand inhabitants is equal to a state with ten million inhabitants is as false as to assert that a thousand is equal to a million or that the canton of Geneva is equal to the continent of Europe" Inequality amongst states became apparent at the Peace Conference of 1919 when the Great Powers showed a tendency to take decisions without the consent of the small powers While the Great powers negotiated the peace treaty with Germany, the small powers were merely asked to sign it The principle of equality of nation-states was again accepted U N O was based on the principle of sovereign equality of all peace-loving states However, formal assertion of equality of the sovereign states by the UN Charter did not deter the great powers from asserting their greatness and special status *The small states could not make equal contributions to the maintenance of* international peace and security Hence the big powers had special responsibility in the matter Therefore, they were allotted permanent seats in the Security Council This tantamounted to grant of right to a murderer to disown his own guilt The organisation was rendered powerless as no nation could be expected to vote for action against itself in case of threat to peace The small states were bitterly opposed to this arrangement However they accepted it in the hope that they would amend it in course of time At present the right of 'sovereign equality of the states' contained in Article 2 of the UN Charter has virtually become a farce

Inequality of Nation-states

All the states cannot be treated as equals since they do not possess equal size or resources Mere assertion of legal equality cannot change the fact As Samuel Grafton observes, "Even after you give the squirrel a certificate which says he is quite as big as any elephant, he is still going to be smaller, and all the squirrels will know it and all the elephants will know it In simple words, it means that even if all the states are legally treated as equal they are not equal on account of unequal distribution of powers among the states The more powerful states have always dominated the international field and a distinction between great powers and small powers has been made on the basis of their power since *the rise of the nation state system* "*A state which had general* interest and which could protect those interests in all spheres was considered a great power A state which possessed only limited power to defend its limited interests was regarded as small power

Super Powers

A new category of states known as superpowers made appearance in *the post-World War II period The two superpowers* were Soviet Union and United States These possessed great mobility of power through which they influenced the pattern of international relations The superiority of the superpowers over other states continued to increase over the years The notion of balance of power underwent a change giving rise to the bipolar system

It maintained great disparity of power between the superpowers and other nation-states. The superpowers again, were distrustful of each other. They were not willing to co-operate. They tended to form blocs. As Aron has pointed out, many states feel that their security can be assured by integrating and concerting their behaviour with that of the leading member of the bloc. After some amount of integration has been reached between the various members of the bloc, it becomes extremely difficult for it to withdraw. This bi-polar system has aggravated the struggle between the two power-blocs, each trying to secure a preponderant capability vis-a-vis its competitor.

Non-Aligned States

A large number of states preferred to keep out of these blocs, since they regarded the cold war between the two superpowers as a selfish struggle. They did not want to get involved in it. These were nonaligned states which tended to act in co-operation with each other and form a sort of bloc. Thus, in modern times the bloc factors are playing more significant role. In the words of Herbert Spire, "International politics today is not conducted between or among nations, nor in its most important phases even between states." However, Prof. Palmer and Perkins have observed that "the nation-state system still forms the political basis and the political framework of international life." In spite of the nature and functioning of the sovereign nation state Friedman rightly asserts, "The nation-state still means political and legal sovereignty, including the right to solve conflicts with other nations by war; it claims the loyalties of its citizens to an extent ultimately incompatible with allegiance to humanity at large and it means a host of economic, social and cultural frontiers in a world which desperately needs understanding among the ordinary citizens of different nations, strangles the free flow and interchange of ideas as well as of persons and goods."

LANDMARKS IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

In 1919 Sir Holfor Mackinder observed in his book *Democratic Idea and Reality* that no practical-idea may be grasped statically. In terms of ephemeral individual life and the transient existence of groups, some aspects of space are permanent such as distribution of land and water over the surface of the globe and the geological formation of the continents. But the boundaries of states are not permanent. They change due to the wars and conquests among large and small nations. These basic facts are, however less significant than the ever-changing functions of the various parts of the globe and the degree of their accessibility. The compass, telecommunications and novel forms of transportation on land, on the sea, and in the air, have brought formerly inhabitable and inexploitable areas within the reach of man.

Era of Space Technology

In modern era of space technology, man has been able to establish an experimental station even on moon Artificial waterways such as the Suez, Panama or White Sea-Baltic canals, *have transformed deserts, swamps and polar* region into arteries of communications and strategic key points The World Powers have extended their competition with each other even into outer space Man shapes social life and is shaped by it From the point of view of politics, man is a member of a group, a political animal Action and reaction inside and between groups is essentially determined by their society or community character, and the wider environment in which such groups operate A mountain range or river may offer protection against invasion until *somebody thinks of* ways and means of overcoming such obstacles

Natural Elements in International Relations

So far, all international societies have ultimately been based on the rule of force It introduces a specific element of instability into the international relations of any age This applies all the more in the present day world in which new discoveries and inventions rapidly follow one another, producing ever new demands for the control of raw materials and involving revolution of the relative strength of the powers German Geopolitical School made a "natural" assumption that Germany was predestined to be controlling factor in the "heartland' It was an open question whether the Third Reich or the Soviet Union would gain exclusive control of the "heartland' or whether they could agree on its joint control In the fight for the 'heartland' the two powers would possibility exhaust or destroy each other Fear of the Western Powers harbouring such intentions *led Russian leaders to the* conclusion of the German-Soviet Non-aggression Pact of 1939 Underestimation of the Russian strength tempted Hitler to fatal aggression against Russia which brought about Russian control of the 'heartland"

Permanent Interest of the Great Powers

The natural elements in international relations are not static due to the permanent interest of great powers in international community Their dynamic foreign policies affect the very natural element in international relations It is a natural phenomenon that the smaller powers always move in the orbit of Great Powers If the smaller powers have not their independent course of action it may be *detrimental to the interests of the Great Powers* But under certain special circumstances, Great Powers may even find it necessary to define such permanent interests for small states This was the case with permanently neutralised countries such as Switzerland and Belgium In such cases, permanent interests were transformed by means of multilateral treaties into binding legal commitments of the Powers participating in these settlements The power politics revolves around

the permanent interests and fixed objects of Great Powers. For instance the Monroe Doctrine and Freedom of Sea have been used for generations to describe two permanent but prominent objects of the U.S. foreign policy. One of the permanent interests of Russian foreign policy is said to be access to ice-free and warm-water ports. British foreign policy has been traditionally linked with the independence of the Low Countries, the Suez Canal and the North-West Frontier.

The Monroe Doctrine (1823)

Monroe Doctrine revealed the extent and depth of the concern of the U.S.A. about the 'intentions of colonisation' by the European Powers on the 'American Continent'. It expressed the opposition of the United States to any further colonisation by European Powers on the American Continent. U.S.A. served warning that she would consider attack on any of the American States recognised by her as the "manifestation of an unfriendly disposition" towards herself. She announced that she herself would not interfere in the "internal concern" of any of the European Powers. This Doctrine was a defensive statement for national security of the U.S.A. Later on it was made compatible with the growing might of the United States on the American Continent. By the time of the President Cleveland, it meant supremacy of the U.S.A. on the American Continent. When U.S.A. grew into a World Power, vindication of the freedom of the seas became one of the major political justification for its entry into the First and Second World War.

After the conclusion of the Second World War, the Monroe Doctrine was merged into a wider concept of the security and defence of the Western hemisphere on purely a co-operative basis with the other American States. This came to include the Philippine, China and Japan in the Pacific, an indefinite part of the Atlantic and the polar regions of the Arctic and Antarctic. Even at present, the United States' forces are stationed in Korea, Germany and Cambodia. Mutual defence aids extend to Western Europe and Pakistan. United States, fleets with nuclear "capability" as well as polarised submarines, patrol the seven seas.

The View of the U.S.S.R.

Since the very beginning Russia sought direct access to the world's oceans. From this point of view the possession of ports on the Baltic and Black Seas was of limited value. Her main thrusts were directed towards the Mediterranean, the Persian Gulf and the acquisition of ice-free ports in the Pacific. This trend in the Russian policy became symbolised in its constant preoccupation with the control of the straits. Thus the Soviet policies were limited to gaining access to the sea in ways which would avoid bringing Russia into conflict with other great powers.

Development after 1901

Since 1901 the British interest in the Low Countries has been a concern of great significance British statesmen realised that if the Low Countries were controlled by a hostile great Power, British security would be threatened This situation remained essentially unfettered until the advent of the aeroplane Then, Britain's Strategic frontier was thought to lie at the Rhine Since 1945, British forces stand guard at the Baltic and the Elbe But due to intercontinental ballistic missiles and tank warfare, national frontiers have lost their meaning They are superseded by security zones Rivers like Rhine and Elbe are no longer barriers in any technical sense They are mere symbols for the rough delimitation of security zones

Due to the division of Germany, the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union became contiguous neighbours in Europe They led to the extension of the original maxim of British foreign policy regarding the Low Lands Similarly the so-called British Monroe Doctrine regarding the Near East (1928) was very much the child of circumstances Gibralter and Malta could secure Britain's access to her possessions and spheres of influence in the Mediterranean before the Suez Canal was built Subsequently, the sea route round the Cape to India and the Pacific was reduced to a poor second best The Suez Canal became part of the lifeline of the British Empire In the decade after the Second World War, it was considered advisable to rely on British bases in Cyrenaica, Cyprus and Kenya for the protection of British interests in the Near and Middle East Yet Monroe Doctrine was for all practical purposes quietly scrapped and merged into the original Monroe Doctrine as reinterpreted in the mid-twentieth Century after the fiasco of the Anglo-French Suez intervention in 1956, the take-over by Egypt of the British Suez Canal base and Iraq's withdrawal from the Baghdad Pact

Before the First World War, Great Britain was considered to be the most important sea Power In 1919, British statesmen Lloyd George and Lord Robert Cecil had faith in Britain's ability to maintain a navy stronger than that of any other sea Power However Colonel House informed that "if challenged the United States would build a navy and maintain an army greater than theirs" Great Britain conceded parity to the United States of the Washington Naval Conference of 1921-22 In the course of the Second World War, the United States became the world's first sea power Being neither able nor willing to fight the United States for the Supremacy of the Seas, British foreign policy had to be redefined, and a new permanent interest emerged

The Two Power Standard of Great Britain

Great Britain has always been a follower of the Two-Power Standard It meant that British sea power could maintain the Union of the Common-wealth and Empire against all oncomers provided that, in future

the United States would not become involved in hostilities with the British Empire. To avoid war with the United States and instead to establish close relation with her, became another permanent interest of British foreign policy. The British Commonwealth came to depend increasingly on the goodwill of the United States, and her awareness of the value of the British Commonwealth as a stabilising factor in international relations. Thus, the interests of great powers changed according to circumstances.

Fulfilment of Political Vacuum

When any power finds a political vacuum it is likely to fill it before other Powers can establish themselves there. Whether the vacuum exists in Cambodia, or in Southern Rhodesia or the Czechoslovakia, or in Bangladesh, the story is much the same. Great Powers launch fishing expedition in the troubled ocean whenever such political vacuum is created by the political turmoil. They try to exert every possible influence to drag troubled State into the sphere of their own influence. If any one of them succeeds in its attempt, its permanent interest in that territory is recognised by other powers. These are transformed into rights under international law. However, great Powers exercise such a stabilising function only during the Zenith period of their existence. Once a particular territory is acquired, the permanent interests of foreign policy of the acquiring state are reformulated in the list of the Churchillian maxim: "What we have we hold."

Balance of Power

In any balance of power system, the permanent interests of great powers count much. The jealousies of other great powers tend to raise obstacles to the unlimited expansion of any one power. A point comes when any of them cannot expand further without the risk of a major war. Germany twice transgressed this line in the twentieth century. She learned to her cost the price of unlimited national ambition. The scope of such unlimited expansion by any of the Great Power against the will of the other Great Powers seems to be very narrow. The so called "balance of power" under traditional international law is not the same today. The old fashioned balance of power has now become balance of terror. Each of the nuclear power is under a state of terror from the other nuclear powers. There is mutual fear in one against the other.

QUESTIONS FOR EXERCISE

1. Explain the value, meaning and origin of sovereign state system.
2. Explain the salient features of modern state system.
3. Discuss critically the statics and dynamics in international relations.
4. "No practical idea, no idea which moves men to action, may be grasped statically." Comment with reference to international relations.
5. Discuss various landmarks that have shaped the relations between the Nations.

6

Sovereignty

The concept of sovereignty according to Professor McIlwain is the central formula under which we try to rationalize the complicated facts of our modern political life [1]

The Meaning of Sovereignty

The earlier writers — Bodin Hobbes Locke Rousseau and modern political scientists — Jellinek Duguit Kelsen and Laski interpreted sovereignty in varying terms During the modern period it has frequently changed its content, its laws and even its functions [2] It has given rise to the concept of popular sovereignty It has been regarded as a major stumbling block to hopes and plans for supernational organisation and cooperation

Few political conceptions observed Professor McIlwain have been the subject of so much discussion amongst us in the last hundred years [3] No word in political science declared Professor Coker is used with a greater variety of meanings [4] Some political scientists contend that the concept is obsolete, or even dangerous

Definition of Sovereignty

The sixteenth-century French political thinker Jean Bodin (1530 96) was the father of the modern theory of sovereignty Published in Paris in 1576 his *De la Republique* contained the first systematic presentation of his theory Sovereignty defined Bodin is the supreme power over citizens and subjects unrestrained by law Thus sovereignty was identified with royal absolutism The power of the sovereign monarch was absolute and unlimited unrestrained by any human authority It was equipped to resist the universalist claims of the papacy and the Empire and

---

1 C H McIlwain *Constitutionalism and the Changing World* (New York Cambridge University Press 1939) p 47

2 Quincy Wright, *A Study of War* (Chicago University of Chicago Press, 1942) II 898 99

3 McIlwain, p 47

4 Francis Coker "Sovereignty *Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences* (New York The Macmillan Company 1937) XIV p 268

the decentralizing, anarchic tendencies of feudalism. Writing less than half a century later. In his famous work *De Jure Belli ac Pacis* Hugo Grotius defined that Sovereignty is "that power whose acts ... may not be made void by the acts of any other human will."

Modern Definitions

1. Oppenheim : "Sovereignty is supreme authority, an authority which is independent of any other earthly authority."

2. Willoughby : "Sovereignty is the supreme will of the state."

3. Kelsen : "In its original and only specific meaning, sovereignty means supreme authority."

Thus sovereignty is the supreme authority, and the ultimate coercive power, which the state processes.

THE SOURCE OF SOVEREIGNTY

Bodin believed that sovereignty resided in the "Sovereign Monarch." If sovereignty was absolute and indivisible, it certainly had to reside in some specific place or person in the governmental structure.

Attempts have been made to distinguish between legal sovereignty and popular sovereignty. It is often claimed, that in England sovereignty rests with "the King in Parliament" meaning the House of Commons. Even in the modern totalitarian states, the location of sovereignty is not easy to determine.

Under present conditions there is little point in attempting to locate the exact source of sovereignty in a state. As Sabine and Shephard pointed out, "all these attempts to fix sovereignty in a particular element of the state ... are futile ... Hence the attempt to find a tangible sovereign is nothing but an attempt to force modern political institutions into a mould of thought which applied to an altogether different state of facts."[5]

CAN SOVEREIGNTY AND INTERNATIONAL LAW

Sovereignty, in its meaning of absolute, unlimited, and indivisible authority, is incompatible with international law. According to the champions of sovereignty, argued Jacques Maritain, "the sovereign State—each individual sovereign state—is by right *above* the community of nations and possessed of absolute independence with regard to this community." Therefore "no international law binding the States can be consistently conceived. Furthermore, this absolute independence is inalienable (*unrenounceable*), because by virtue of its nature the state is a monadic entity which cannot cease to be sovereign without ceasing to be a state. As a

---

5. Hugo Krabbe, *The Modern Idea of the State* (New York : Appleton, 1927), p. xxvii.

result, no day can down—as long as the States behave consistently with their so-called Sovereignty—on which they could possibly give up their supreme independence in order to enter a large political body, or a world society"[6] Hans Morgenthau holds that "the conception of a divisible sovereignty is contrary to logic and politically unfeasible a significant symptom of the discrepancy between the actual and pretended relations existing between *international law and international politics in the modern state system*"[7] Sovereignty is on state's sovereignty in the interests of international cooperation is theoretically untenable and practically *impossible*

Thus, "from the standpoint of international law the concept of absolute sovereignty is no longer valid'[8]

To conclude with Clyde Eagleton sovereignty cannot be an absolute *term It is just as foolish to say that sovereignty must be surrendered or* eliminated as to say that it must be absolute and unrestrained The problem is not one of asking whether we should throw off a thing called sovereignty, it is rather one of asking with regard to what matters would we gain by having an international control, and in which matters would we gain more by reserving control to ourselves?"[9]

Pointing out the present curtailment of sovereignty I B Kravis said, "Since the government in effect remain in the saddle the diminution in sovereignty is, at least at the outset, not far beyond that entailed in a close concert of nations pursuing agreed upon objectives and sufficiently committed so that it is difficult to turn back Sovereignty is curtailed in *the EEC, but it is not as a result of turning power over to an international or* super national body of administrators as Schuman seemed to be suggesting in his first proposal for a coal and steel community Sovereignty has been curtailed as a result, first, of accepting a broad commitment to follow common policies moving towards economic and eventually political integration Secondly, sovereignty has been restricted by international arrangements that expose each member to more readily applied pressures from the others and subsequently to the possibility of having a decision imposed by some combination of the other member countries"[10]

6 Jacques Maritain, *Man and the State* (Chicago University of Chicago Press 1951) pp 50-51

7 Hans J Morgenthau, *Politics Among Nations*, 3rd ed (New York Alfred A Knopf 1962), p 326

8 S C Rath, "National Sovereignty in the Present Day World," *The Indian Journal of Political Science*, XXV (July-September December, 1964), pp 29-30

9 *The forces that Shape Our Future* (New York New York University Press, 1945) p 174

10 Irving B Kravis, *Domestic Interests and International Obligations* (Philadelphia University of Pennsylvania Press, 1963) pp 361, 362

Internal *Vs.* External Sovereignty

Some students of political science and international law have attempted to distinguish between absolute and indivisible internal sovereignty and limited external sovereignty. Both Bodin and John Austin (1790-1859) were primarily concerned with the internal aspects of sovereignty. In his study *Mandates under the League of Nations* Quincy Wright declared : "From the point of view of Municipal law, sovereignty is a unity incapable of division or limitation, from the point of view of international law it is susceptible to analysis, division and limitation ... . External sovereignty or status exists in so far as a state can change, by unilateral action, the jural relations with other states, and must be distinguished from internal sovereignty or independence."[11]

Other Concepts

Wright also distinguished between "partial" and "full" sovereignty, and between "political" and "legal" sovereignty. Elsewhere, he suggested that the three aspects of national sovereignty that "are in most need of limitation" are "the power of self-judgment in international controversies, the power to prepare and use armed force in international relations, and the power to impose arbitrary barriers to international trade."[12]

In his *Recent Theories of Sovereignty* H.E. Cohen pointed out that "international law finds room for the concepts of joint sovereignty, divided sovereignty, and the sovereignty of international corporations."[13]

In the text of Article 14 of the Draft Declaration on Rights and Duties of States, prepared by the International Law Commission of the United Nations, it has been said: "Every State has the duty to conduct its relations with other States in accordance with international law and with the principle that the sovereignty of each State is subject to the supremacy of international law."

The writers of this article Hans Kelsen, insisted might have been wise if they avoided the use of the term "sovereignty" in this connection since they did not define it "in a way compatible with international law."[14]

---

11. Quincy Wright, *Mandates Under the League of Nations* (Chicago : University of Chicago Press, 1930), pp. 289, 291.
12. "Fundamental Problems of International Organization," *International Conciliation,* No. 369 (April 1941), pp. 469-72.
13. H.E. Cohen, *Recent Theories of Sovereignty* (Chicago : University of Chicago Press, 1937) p. 85.
14. "The Draft Declaration on Rights and Duties of States," *The American Journal of International Law*, XLIV (April, 1950), 276.

The idea of accepting, or even encouraging, limitations on sovereignty has become commonplace today The constitutions of a few nation-states contain provisions for the surrender of sovereignty under certain conditions and for certain stated objectives Article 24 of the Basic Law of the Federal Republic of Germany states that the Parliament "*will consent to such* limitations upon its sovereign powers as will bring about and secure a peaceful and lasting order in Europe and among the nations of the world" The Draft Constitution of Ghana of 1960 contained the following arresting provision " in the confident expectation of an early surrender to a union of *African states and territories, the people now confer on the Parliament* the power to provide for the surrender of the whole or of any part of the sovereignty of Ghana"

In Western Europe one finds some of the most ardent champions of national sovereignty and also some of its most vigorous critics De Gaulle was an outspoken opponent of all efforts to diminish France's sovereignty in any way In 1960 he referred to "sovereign statehood and national independence" as "the *incontestable foundations of all French politics*" To Speak, one of the great spokesmen for European unity, such a position runs counter to the course Europe and the world must take in the interests of mutual cooperation for survival and human betterment At the *Pacem in Terris* conference in New York in February, 1965, he declared flatly "We must renounce *absolute national sovereignty*"

SHOULD THE CONCEPT OF SOVEREIGNTY BE DISCARDED ?

Though sovereignty, in its literal sense, means supreme authority, yet it must be limited under present conditions Though it is absolute and *indivisible, yet it must be qualified and divided* Though it is incompatible with international law, yet it must be reconciled with it

Faced with these contradictions, some political theorists have concluded that the term and doctrine of "sovereignty," should be abandoned In 1916, in *The Problem of Sovereignty*, Harold J Laski, predicted "The sovereignty of the state will pass, as the divine right of kings has had its day" In *A Grammar of Politics* he wrote " it would be of lasting benefit to political science if *the whole concept of sovereignty were surrendered*"[15]

Jacques Maritain concluded "The two concepts of Sovereignty and Absolutism have been forged together on the same anvil They must be scrapped together"[16]

---

15 Harold J Laski *The Problem of Sovereignty* (Cambridge, Mass Harvard University Press, 1916) p 209, and *A Grammar of Politics* (New Haven Yale University Press 1925) pp 44-45

16 Maritain p 53

John Scholte Nollen said "The first piece of old lumber that must be discarded in this new day is the obsolete idea of 'sovereignty'."[17]

Carl J. Friedrich argued that "both 'state' and 'sovereignty' " in current usage "are symbols of totalitarian government" and are "fraught with implications that are incompatible not only with democracy but with the essence of Christianity."[18]

However at the end of his careful study of theories of sovereignty, H.E. Cohen concluded that "the theory of sovereignty will persist as a term defining power or the status of that power, or as a term defining a legal order, or the status of parts within that order or the totality of that order." Even if the word "sovereignty" disappears with changes in terminology, Cohen believed that "the substance of sovereignty will remain so long as the problems of social control divided men into rulers and ruled, into leaders and led."[19]

Perhaps he should have revised the last part of his prediction to read: "so long as the nation-state system, remains the prevailing pattern of international society." Those who view sovereignty with suspicion may E.H. Carr remind that the concept of sovereignty "is likely to become in the future even more blurred and indistinct than it is at present. ... It was never more than a convenient label."[20]

QUESTIONS FOR EXERCISE

1. Define sovereignty and discuss its source.
2. Should the concept of sovereignty be discarded ?

---

17. "Sovereignty" in Stuart Gerry Brown, ed., *Internationalism and Democracy* (Syracuse : Syracuse University Press, 1949), p. 48.
18. *The New Belief in the Common Man* (Boston : Little, Brown and Company, 1942), p. 79.
19. Cohen, pp. 147, 148.
20. *The Twenty Years' Crisis*, 1919-1939, 2nd ed. (London, 1946), p. 230.

7

Nationalism and National Interest

Meaning of Nation

One of the most satisfactory definition of nation was advanced by Ernest Barker more than forty years ago A nation is a body of men, inhabiting a definite territory, who normally are drawn from different races, but possess a common stock of thoughts and feelings acquired and transmitted during the course of a common history, who on the whole and in the main, though more in the past than in the present, include in that common stock a common religious belief, who generally and as a rule use a common language as the vehicle of their thoughts and feelings, and who, besides common thoughts and feelings, also cherish a common will, and accordingly form, or tend to form, a separate state for the expression and realization of that will [1]

What Constitutes A Nation ?

In his famous lecture at the Sorbonne in 1882, Ernest Renan said, "What constitutes a nation, is not speaking the same tongue or belonging to the same ethnic group, but having accomplished great things in common in the past and the wish to accomplish them in the future"

A nation is not necessarily the human and physical incarnation of a state A state may composed of several nations We often speak of the multinational state But as in modern parlance the terms *nation* and *state* are used almost interchangeably, the major political units which exist today may appropriately be called *nation-states* As Hans Morgenthau suggests, "the nation needs a state *'One nation—one state' is thus the political postulate of nationalism, the nation-state is its idea".*[2]

Meaning of Nationality

Nationality may be defined as the distinctive quality of a group which has a common origin and tradition It may imply both national character and the spirit of belongingness to a nation or a group of people possessed of such

---

1 *National Character and the Factors in Its Formation* (London, 1927), p 17,

2 Morgenthau, p 160

a spirit. The sociologist Louis Wirth defines a nationality as "a people who, because of the belief in this common descent and their mission in the world, by virtue of their common cultural heritage and historical career aspire to sovereignty over a territory or seek to maintain or enlarge their political or cultural influence in the face of opposition."[3] Frederick Hertz defined it as "a community formed by the will to be a nation."[4] It is "nothing material or mechanical," observed Arnold J. Toynbee, "but a subjective psychological feeling in a living people."[5]

Meaning of National Self-Determination

According to Hayes, *National self-determination* means "the right of individuals to determine the sovereign state to which they would belong and the form of government under which they would live."[6] It is the principle by which nationalities justify their efforts to acquire "nationhood" in the form of "statehood".

Meaning of Patriotism

Patriotism may be defined as love of country. It is not necessarily associated with the nation-state. The addresses of Pericles to the Athenians, of Hannibal to the Carthaginians, of Cicero to the Romans are among the greatest examples of patriotic oratory. Today, however, patriotism, like nationalism, is associated with loyalty to the nation-state. Though it inspires some of the finest of human sentiments, it can become intense narrow and infinitely dangerous. In its exaggerated form it is known as *chauvinism.*

MEANING OF NATIONALISM

1. Hayes. Nationalism consists of "a modern emotional fusion and exaggeration of two very old phenomena—nationality and patriotism".[7]

2. Hans Kohn. "Nationalism is first and foremost a state of mind, an act of consciousness."[8]

3. Professor Louis L. Snyder. "... Nationalism a product of political, economic, social, and intellectual factors at a certain stage in history, is a condition of mind, feeling, or sentiment of a group of people living in a

3. Louis Wirth, "Types of Nationalism," *American Journal of Sociology,* XLI (May, 1936), 723.
4. Frederick Hertz, *Nationality in History and Politics,* 3rd ed. (London, 1951), p. 12.
5. Arnold J. Toynbee, *Nationality and War* (London, 1915), p. 13.
6. Hayes, p. 10.
7. Carlton J. H. Hayes, *Essays on Nationalism* (New York : The Macmillan Company, 1926), p. 6.
8. Hans Kohn, *The Idea of Nationalism* (New York : The Macmillan Company, 1944), p. 10.

well-defined geographical area, speaking a common language, possessing a literature in which the aspirations of the nation have been expressed, attached to common traditions and common customs, venerating its own heroes, and, in some cases, having a common religion"[9]

CRITICISM OF NATIONALISM

In Twentieth century nationalism became "the common form of political life all over the earth," but 'everywhere nationalism differs in character according to the specific historic conditions and the peculiar social structure of each country" Due to the "stress upon national sovereignty and cultural distinctiveness" Nationalism has became "a deeply divisive force' When it "spread to Eastern Europe and later to Asia nationalism tended toward the closed society, in which the individual counted for less than the strength and authority of the national whole"[10]

"Nationalism," said Snyder, "is neither wholly logical nor rational Its roots lie in the illogical, irrational, and fantastic world of the unconscious" It is "in part a psychological response to grave threats of insecurity" Since it "is not innate instinct, but rather a socially conditioned, synthetic sentiment," it cannot be understood without reference to the findings of psychology and psychoanalysis[11]

THE DANGERS OF NATIONALISM

Modern nationalism was associated with democracy and liberty But today far from promoting democracy and liberty nationalism often places these blessings in jeopardy It has often proved to be wholly compatible with autocracy and totalitarianism Unless carefully watched it tends to restrict the area of human freedom Nationalism and liberty are not coterminous, while the former may prove to be an ephemeral phenomenon in history the latter will long endure

Nationalism is generally condemned as an evil force because it tends to degenerate into ever more intolerant forms which have been a major cause of war In the final chapter of his *Essays on Nationalism*, Hayes distinguished between nationalism as a historical fact and nationalism as a belief As a belief, nationalism has been "a curse and nothing but a curse" Rabindranath Tagore held that nationalism was a great menace because it called for a "strenuous effort after strength and efficiency' and thereby "drains man's energy from his higher nature where he is self sacrificing

---

9 Snyder, pp 196 97

10 *Prophets and Peoples Studies in Nineteenth Century Nationalism* (New York The Macmillan Company, 1946) p 4

11 Snyder, pp 89 110

and creative."[12] Arnold Toynbee's *A Study of History* contains many references to crimes committed in the name of the nation-state and of nationalism during the last three or four hundred years. As Vladimir Solovyev wrote about nationalism: "In its extreme form it destroys a nation, for it makes it the enemy of mankind."[13]

INSTRUMENTS OF NATIONALISM

The schools, the press, and the radio are the most powerful instruments for the propagation of nationalism. These instruments are deliberately used to serve the state. Nationalistic propaganda is widespread even in the free world. In America nationalistic propaganda is found in textbooks in use in all schools, from the primary to the most advanced levels. Texts have been criticized as "un-American" because they gave too favourable treatment to unicameralism, social security, and the United Nations. In Los Angeles, local pressures were generated to prevent instruction in the public schools on the work of UNESCO.

SYMBOLS OF NATIONALISM

Nationalism is propagated by the use of symbols and "social myths." Among the most commonly used symbols are patriotic slogans and songs, flags, uniforms, shrines and monuments, public spectacles, pageantry, and ritualism. These symbols may encourage love of country. Beliefs in them are among the finest of human sentiments. However these same symbols may and do serve dangerous masters when they are used to instill hatred of other peoples and a false sense of the nation's "glory" and "destiny." As Hayes said, "Integral nationalism has surpassed all its predecessors in rites and ceremonies, in mysticism and devotion, and likewise in intolerance."[14] This has been observed in Fascist Italy, Nazi Germany, Communist Russia, and Communist China.

FORMS OF NATIONALISM

Nationalism defined, it does has diverse forms which can be analyzed in different ways. It has been described as "good" and "bad," constructive and destructive, material and spiritual, conscious and subconscious. Hans Kohn has drawn a most useful distinction between (1) nationalism in the Western world and (2) nationalism outside the Western World. It helps to explain "the process of cultural influence and resistance in non-European areas."[15] The most complete analysis of the origins of nationalism of Kohn's *The Idea of Nationalism.* Among the best summaries of the historical evolution of

12. Rabindranath Tagore, *Nationalism* (London, 1917), p. 110.
13. Kohn, *Prophets and People*, p. 205.
14. Hayes, *Historical Evolution*, p. 299.
15. Snyder, p. 121.

Nationalism are Hayes, *The Historical Evolution of Modern Nationalism*, Shafer, *Nationalism Myth and Reality*, Kohn, *Nationalism Its Meaning and History*

Stages of Nationalism

1 *Views of Hayes* Hayes described five principal successive types of stages of Nationalism— humanitarian, Jacobin, traditional, liberal, and integral The first four types originated in the eighteenth century and took distinctive form in the period of the French Revolution and Napoleon and during the nineteenth century Integral nationalism was a growth of the twentieth century, characterized by the policies of totalitarian states

2. *View of Wright.* A similar classification of the stages in the development of nationalism is presented in Quincy Wright's monumental work, *A Study of War* [16] Wright discussed in succession medieval, monarchical, revolutionary, liberal, and totalitarian nationalism

3 *Views of Snyder* Professor Snyder discerned four stages in the Chronology of Nationalism Integrative Nationalism (1815-71), Disruptive Nationalism (1871-90), Aggressive Nationalism (1890-1945), and Contemporary Nationalism (since 1945) During the first stage nationalism was a unifying force, expressed in the unification of Italy and of Germany During the second, subject nationalities of Austria Hungary and other multinational states clamoured for independence During the third, "Nationalism became virtually identical with aggressive imperialism," and the "collision of opposing national interests" *led to two world wars During the early years of the contemporary stage* "political nationalism asserted itself in the form of widespread revolts again European masters," and communism "in its Stalinist form took on the of nationalism in the Soviet Union "[17]

NATIONALISM IN THE TWENTIETH CENTURY

Before the outbreak of World War I, many people believed that while the nineteenth century had been an age of nationalism, the twentieth century would be an age of internationalism However, in the twentieth century *nationalism assumed everywhere virulent forms It continued to shape* the international politics of the Western World It become a worldwide pheno- menon, attaining new heights of emotionalism In the newly emergent states of Asia and Africa, it achieved a curious kind of linkage with international communism It was one of the underlying causes of the First World War Professor Hayes said, "Nationalism paved the way of statesmen and prepared the mind of peoples for the World War Its immediate

16 See the section on the evolution of nationalism in the chapter entitled "Nationalism and War," II, 1004-1009

17 Snyder pp 116-17

cause was the murderous activity of a secret nationalistic society of Jugoslavs. Its fighting was done by "nations in arms," whose morale was sustained by nationalist propaganda.... Its most obvious immediate result was the triumph of the principle of national self-determination in central and eastern Europe. The last of the non-national empires on the continent were shattered— the Austrian, the Russian and the Ottoman and from their ruins were constructed new or enlarged nation states .... The World War not only issued from Nationalism but led to a more intense nationalism. In Europe the newest nation states almost instantly passed from liberal pronouncements to illiberal conduct and speedily vied with older nation states in establishing nationalist tariffs, armies, schools, and other agencies of propaganda and in discriminating socially if not legally against dissident minorities." [18]

KINDS OF 20TH CENTURY NATIONALISM

1. Totalitarian Nationalism

(A) Fascism. Fascism gained power in Italy only three years after Versailles, in Germany and Japan in the early thirties, and in Spain in 1936. It was the first lush flowering of modern totalitarianism. It was a form of Nationalism more powerful, more encompassing, more brutal, and more dangerous than any previous variety. To quote Kohn "Though this fascist nationalism took various forms in different countries, according to their national traditions and social structures, it represented in all its forms a total repudiation of the liberal ideas of the seventeenth and eighteenth century revolutions, of the rights of the individual and of the desirability of a rational international order based upon the equality of men and nations.... Nationalism in its fascist period ... assumed for beyond anything known in the period before 1914, an absolutist and extremist self-assertiveness, glorifying war between nations or races as the supreme and final meaning of life and history."[19] It was this type of Nationalism which culminated in World War II.

(B) Communism. Unlike fascism communism is an international and not a national gospel. In practice, however, both within and outside the Communist world, communism has become increasingly nationalistic. The Soviet rulers posed as champions of nationalism in Asia and as enemies of colonialism and imperialism. Native Communist leaders identifying themselves with nationalist movements, scored notable successes in Indo-China, Korea, and China. The Chinese Communists succeeded in taking over the nationalist revolution that had been underway ever since it had overthrown the Manchu dynasty in 1911-12.

---

18. Hayes, *'Nationalism,'* p. 247.
19. 1. Kohn, *'Nationalism and Internationalism in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries,'* p. 210.

During World War II, when German armies were occupying the western part of Russia, the Russian people were exhorted to rise up in defense of "Mother Russia" In the postwar years the Soviet government encouraged the nationalism of Russia's many minorities, permitting their cultural, political, and economic institutions to be "national' in form as long as they are "proletarian" in spirit and substance

Since his open break with the rest of the Communist world, Tito has relied primarily on Yugoslav nationalism Elsewhere in the Communist world communism has gone national

2. Integral Nationalism

Charles Maurras and Maurice Barres, have called "integral nationalism," the characteristic form of the twentieth century Maurras himself once described integral nationalism as "the exclusive pursuit of national policies, the absolute maintenance of national integrity, and the steady increase of national power—for a nation declines when it loses military might " Hans Morgenthau has insisted that there is a basic difference between the nationalism of the nineteenth century and the "nationalistic universalism" of today

"To call by the same name what inspired the oppressed and competing nationalities of the nineteenth century and what drives the superpowers of the mid twentieth century into deadly combat, is to obscure the fundamental change which separates our age from the preceding one The nationalism of today, which is really a nationalistic universalism, has only one thing in commons with the nationalism of the nineteenth century—the nation as the ultimate point of reference for political loyalties and actions But here the similarity ends For Nationalism of the nineteenth century the nation is the ultimate goal of political action, the endpoint of the political development beyond which there are other nationalisms with s [illegible] and equally justifiable goals For the nationalistic universalism of the mid twentieth century the nation is but the starting point of a universal mission whose ultimate goal reaches to the confines of the political world While nationalism wants one nation in a state and nothing else, the nationalistic universalism of our age claims for one nation and one state the right to impose its own valuations and standards of action upon all the other nations "[20] Morgenthau's "nationalistic universalism" is not nationalism but a peculiar interpretation of the foreign policy objectives of the superpowers

Thus the twentieth century has proved to be another age of nationalism Nationalism expanded to the emerging countries of Asia and Africa It survived in the Western World where it made devil's efforts to formulate common defense

---

20 Morgenthau p 337

or economic policies. The reactions in Britain and France during the Suez crisis of 1956 and in the United States during the Cuban crises of 1961 and 1962 evinced deep nationalistic emotions. General de Gaulle was an unabashed champion of French nationalism, the re-unification of the German nation remains an aspiration for the people of both East and West Germany.

INTERNATIONALISM

The twentieth century is also an era of increasing interdependence and internationalism. In the words of Kohn "The Nationalism of the post- 1945 era is in many ways, different from that of 1900. It regards itself as compatible with international or supernational organisations; it knows of the interdependence brought about by recent technological changes .... Nationalism has assumed again in most countries, and not only in the 'new' countries, the populist and revolutionary character which it had before 1848."[21]

Today, as Professor Kohn has observed, "we are living in the age of pan-nationalism on all continents." It is not surprising that Nationalism has assumed so many different forms ranging from Communist patterns and ultra nationalistic forms to constructive associations of national and international trends and movements.

Future Role of Nationalism

"Undoubtedly, it is a divisive force in a world growing more and more interdependent, a force capable of producing bitter tensions and one-sided, selfrighteous judgments that threaten the rational solution of international conflicts." But "today the possibility is growing that ... the age of nationalism and of warring nation-states" may be transformed "into an age of an uneasy but on the whole peaceful coexistence of nationalism with their various civilizations, traditions, and ideologies, which, like everything in history, are subject to change and transformation."[22]

The doctrine of nationalism has given strength and cohesion to the prevailing pattern of international society. It has been a flexible doctrine, evolving through the years as conditions have changed and giving rise to many schools of interpreters. It has been used in the interests of democracy and liberalism, as well as in those of absolutism and totalitarianism. Actually there is nothing inherently evil about it. D.W. Brogan called nationalism "this great destructive, constructive force."

---

21. Kohn, *'Nationalism and Internationalism in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries,'* pp. 219-20.
22. *Ibid.*, pp. 239-40.

If uncontrolled or misused, it can lead to tyranny and war, but if directed to constructive purposes it can evoke some of the finest of human sentiments for the service of worthy ends

NATIONAL INTEREST

What is the National Interest ?

The foreign policy of every country is at all times designed to promote the national interest A volume published by The Brookings Institution makes a helpful distinction among national interests, objectives, policies, and comments "Stated broadly, *interests* are what a nation feels to be necessary to its security and well-being, *objectives* are interests sharpened to meet particular international situations, *policies* are thoughtout ways of attaining *objectives* and *commitments* are specific undertakings in support of policy" Again *National interests* reflects the general and continuing ends for which a nation acts '[23]

Definition of National Interest

1. Objectivist and Subjectivist Definitions. Joseph Frankel has divided the various approaches adopted to define the concept of national interests into two broad categories—objectivist and subjectivist In the first category are included all those approaches which view national interest as a concept which can be defined or examined with the help of some definable criteria In the second one are included those definitions which seek to interpret national interest as a "constantly changing pluralistic set of subjective references"

2 Broad and Single Interest Definition Differences regarding the of the concept of national interest are found between those who view it in broad sense and those who conceive it in terms of a number of concrete single interest Generally the decisions at the operational level are conceived in a narrow context and only few dimensions are taken into account At this level the process of reasoning is inductive while at other levels it becomes more deductive Again, the people with theoretical inclination take greater interest in the aggregate, while those with scientific bias lay more emphasis on the single dimension of the concept

3. Brooking's Institute. National interest is "the general and continuing ends for which a nation acts"

4 Charles Lerche and Abul Said *National interest is "the general* long-term and continuing purpose which the state, the nation, and the government all see themselves as serving"

---

23 *Major Problems* 1950-1951, pp 243 383

5. **Dyke.** National interest is an interest which the states seek to protect or achieve in relation to each other. While the above two definitions interpret national interest in terms of permanent guide to the action of the state, the definition of Dyke mainly refers to national interest as an action. Obviously, the first two definitions seem to be more logical.

Development of the Concept

In the ancient and the medieval times the states pursued certain substantial interests on the basis of which their relations were conducted. In the early middle ages the laws of Christianity formed the basis of these relations and the states were expected to ensure that their laws conformed to these principles. However, with the emergence of the secular power the Church was looked upon as the enemy of national interest. The national interest meant the interest of a particular monarch in holding fast to his territories due in extending his domains and in aggrandizement of his empire. In course of time the popular bodies challenged the authority of the monarchs and asserted themselves. This resulted in the growth of democracy. Now the 'honour of the prince was replaced by the honour of the nation'. Thus the concept of national interest passed from the feudal and monarchical system to the republic and democratic system. It soon gained a common usage in the political and diplomatic literature. Thus the term 'national interest' gained currency only after the emergence of the national state system, increase in popular political control and the great expansion of economic relations.

Types of National Interest

Thomas W. Robinson has broadly classified the national interest into six categories, viz., primary interest, secondary interest, permanent interest, variable interest, general interest and specific interest. These are as follows:

1. **Primary Interests.** These include the preservation of physical, political, and cultural identity of the state against possible encroachments from outside powers. These interests are permanent and the state must defend them at all costs. No compromise of these interests is possible.

2. **Secondary Interests.** These are less important than the primary interests though quite vital to the existence of the state. These include the protection of the citizens abroad and ensuring of diplomatic immunities for the diplomatic staff.

3. **Permanent Interests.** These refer to the relatively constant and long-term interests of the state. The change in the permanent interests is rather slow. An example of this type of national interest is provided by the determination of Britain to maintain freedom of navigation during the past few centuries for the protection of her overseas colonies and growing trade.

4 Variable Interests These refer to those interests of a nation, which are considered vital for national good in a given set of circumstances Thus the variable interests can diverge from both primary and permanent interests These are largely determined by 'the cross currents of personalities, public opinion, sectional interests, partisan politics, and political and moral folkways'

5. General Interests. These refer to those positive conditions which apply to a large number of nations or in several specified fields such as economics, trade, diplomatic intercourse etc For example, it was the general national interests of Britain to maintain balance of power on the European continent

6 Specific Interests Through the logical outgrowth of the general interests, specific interests are defined in terms of time or space For example, Britain considered it a specific national interest to maintain the independence of the Low countries for the sake of preservation of balance of power in Europe

7. Identical Interests In addition to the above six types of national interest, Prof Robinson refers to three other interests which he calls "international interests' These include the identical interests, complementary interests and conflicting interests The *Identical interests* refer to interests which are held in common by a number of states For example both U S A and Britain have been interested that Europe should not be dominated by any single power

8 Complementary Interests These refer to those interests, which not identical, can form the basis of agreement on some specific For example Britain was interested in the independence of Portugal against Spain because it wanted to control to reign of the Atlantic Ocean Similarly, Portugal was interested in the British maritime hegemony because this was a safe means of defence against Spain

9. Conflicting Interests These are interests other than the identical and the complementary interests These are not fixed These undergo a change due to the force of events and diplomacy Thus, the present time conflicting interests may become complementary interests in future Likewise, the complementary and identical interests may also get transformed into conflicting interests

Methods for Promotion of National Interest

Broadly speaking three methods are used for the promotion of national interests

1 Coercive measures
2 Alliances
3 Diplomatic negotiations

1. Coercive Measures. The coercive measures adopted by the states for the enforcement of national interest broadly fall into two categories according to Beard (i) The measures taken within the state which do not infringe directly upon the state against whom they are taken and (ii) Measures directly operating against the state which are the object of enforcement procedure. The acts falling in this category are of negative character, even though they may produce positive effect. Some of the important measures which fall in this category include acts of non-intercourse, embargoes, boycots, retaliation and reprisal, severance of diplomatic relations etc. Any one or all of these measures can be employed by the state for the advancement and enforcement of its national interest. Even though these measures are considered coercive they are non-violent in character and do not produce any international crisis. These involve the use of physical force. These are of quite a wide range and include actual display of force. History is replete with numerous examples when different states resorted to the display of force to enforce their national interest. The state can also take certain measures on its own soil to advance its national interests which ultimately operate against the enemy state. These include action like seizure and confiscation of the property of the offending state or its subjects by way of compensation in value for the wrong, suspension of operation of treaties, embargo of ships belonging to the offending states lying within its ports, seizure of ships at sea etc. All these methods are *prima facie* act of war. The state against whom they are directed has to determine whether it wants to engage in war or not. In extreme form these measures can take the shape of actual bombardment of coastal areas or military occupation of an inland centre.

2. Alliances. Alliances are concluded by two or more nations for the protection and promotion of common interests. As a result of the alliance the protection of these common interests becomes a legal obligation which the member states are duty bound to discharge. These alliances may be concluded for the protection of a large variety of national interests. Their nature and the duration depends on the nature of the interest sought to be protected. According to Prof. Robinson, "The advantage of pursuing the national interests through alliances, of course, lies in the translation of inchoate, common or complementary interest into common policy and in bringing, the nation's power directly to bear on questions of national interest."

Relations of Alliance to National Interests

Prof. Morgenthau has advanced the following propositions regarding the relations of alliance to national interests.

(i) ***Duration.*** The degree of generality of common interests expressed in alliance are related to the duration of the alliance. Thus the general alliances will be of short duration while the limited alliance shall be long lasting.

(ii) *Primacy* The relative degree of primacy of national interests expressed in an alliance is inversely proportional to the power of the nation Thus a weak and a strong nation will enter into alliance to defend the primary and secondary interests respectively

(iii) *Strength* The weaker partner of alliance is dependent on the stronger one and is tolerated as long as there is complete identity of interests between the two

(iv) *Interest* Even if an alliance is based on equality it will not succeed unless there is identity of interests

(v) *Balance* A one-sided alliance, in which one party receives the benefits and the other party carries most of the burden, can be concluded only if there are complementary interests

(vi) *Cohesion* The degree of cohesion of an alliance depends on the community of interests felt by the participants

(vii) *Legal Ties* It is not essential that every community of interests should be given the shape of an alliance because the legal ties between two nations cannot overbalance the national interests of the nation

(viii) *Ideology* Ideology can help in strengthening the bonds of an alliance provided the alliance is based on common or complementary interests If there is no community of interests in the alliance, the alliance based on ideology alone cannot be effective

(ix) *Common Enemy* Finally, the alliance built by the nations against a third country or common enemy are generally vague and lack concrete objectives

3. Diplomatic Negotiations Diplomatic negotiations are used to reconcile the divergent interests of the state through the process of "mutual give and take" These prove fruitful only if the interests of concerned states are complementary or compatible In such cases an agreement can be reached through mutual bargaining In the case of incompatible or conflicting interests negotiations are virtually impossible

In the larger interests of the international community the states must try to protect certain common interest, for example, they must avoid use of nuclear weapons They should not resort to war in view of the highly destructive nature of these weapons They must realise that the outbreak of a war will not only mean the possibility of their defeat but also destruction of the domestic society and civilization They must prefer diplomacy over war

NATIONAL INTERESTS AND FOREIGN POLICY

Foreign Policy is Based on National Interests

The national interests influence the formulation of foreign policy of a country. The states generally do not publically admit that their foreign policies are based on their self-interest. However, responsible people have admitted this fact. For example American Secretary of State Hughes admitted in the 1920's that "Foreign policies are not abstractions but the results of practical concepts of national interest." In his article "Another Great Debate : The National Interest of United States" Morgenthau asserts that the foreign policy "seeks the defence of the national interest by peaceful means" and to defend the national interest restrictively and rationally defined "against the national interests of other nations which may or may not be thus defined." I.D. Duchacek has observed "National leaders as a rule never pursue national policies that are in the interest of any nation other than their own." He further asserts "In planning, formulating, adopting and executing foreign policy, national leaders and their aids are confronted with a variable spider's web of conflicting claims and values. Yet priorities, that is, the practical not ideal, contents of the national interest must finally be established in terms of preferred goals and in relation to the power of one's own nation and that of other nations. Both national goals and national means must simultaneously be related to dangers or opportunities on the international scene; not only other nation's power but also their intentions must be properly evaluated." In short, the national interest is the predominant factor in the formulation of a country's foreign policy.

Foreign Policy is not Based on National Interests Alone

Prof. Reynolds holds that it is not always possible to base the foreign policy of a state on its national interests alone. He argues that the foreign policy of a state can be based on national interest only if the interests of the various nations are homogeneous. It shall indeed be a costly proposition to pursue a policy based on national interests, when the interests of the various nations are of a heterogeneous character. This is likely to lead to a war. As Reynolds puts it "Since self-extending heterogeneous values of unlimited range must almost certainly lead to major armed conflict, national interests must require their limitations. National interests cannot, therefore, always in all circumstances be identified with the values of the community; and when to this is added disagreement about the basic general purposes for which humans exist the difficulty of giving any generally applicable empirical content to the nations of national interest becomes apparent."

Promotion of Self-Interest

The leaders of a state do not necessarily always try to promote the national interest alone Sometimes they use foreign policy as a tool to strengthen their internal position For example, Sukarno of Indonesia diverted the people *from the acute economic and social problems* by adopting the policy of confrontation towards Malaysia

Maintenance of Status Quo

Sometimes the national interest comes to be equated with the maintenance of the existing political institutions even at the cost of the interests of the general people The statesmen normally assume that the survival of the state, over which they preside, is the supreme national interest though it may not always be so For example, it attempts to preserve the state lead to the destruction of its people, then these attempts could not be in the national interest In other words, the national interest of the people could be served by the demise of the state But such an action is not likely to be approved by the political leaders, to whatever political party they may belong Thus the decisions of the political leaders are not always taken in the larger national interest

Limitation of the Concept

Prof Reynolds asserts that ' the concept of national interest is, therefore, an unfortunate and on the whole unhelpful one It is normally attached to the notion of the estate and so sacrifices state goals It directs attention to a [illegible] human group into which human ought to be organised and the [illegible] and advancement of which accordingly ought to be the criteria for judgement of action But if individuals are the proper referent, a distinction needs to be drawn between strictly state goals and the goals that national interest prescribes " He further argues that in essence national interest "should relate to the real interests of the people, and this interest is not to be seen as being necessarily contained within the state context This notion of a 'real interest' is difficult to conceive But even if it can be seen as a theoretical norm, it cannot in practice be identified and will not serve as a means of judging particular decision or particular actions State decision makers who claim to be acting in the national interest misuse the notion, cannot have the perfect information necessary to validate their claims and so are pulling the wool over other people's eyes, and possibly over their own "

CONSTRAINTS ON NATIONAL INTEREST

Foreign policy claiming to operate in the national interest must have *some reference* to the physical, political and cultural entity called the nation Morgenthau maintained that it must be determined in the light of possible usurpation by subnational, other national and supernational interests These

are serious constraints on the national interest.

1. Subnational Interests. At the subnational level there is group interest particularly represented by ethnic and economic groups. These tend to identify themselves with the national interest. Thus they confuse the issue.

2. Other national Interests. The other national interests may usurp the national interest of a state in two ways, viz., through treason and criminology.

(i) *Treason.* An individual may commit treason on behalf of a foreign government either out of conviction or out of monetary gains.

(ii) *Criminology.* This may prompt a person to promote the interests of a foreign government. There is every possibility of an ethnic minority of a country identifying itself with a foreign government and promote its interests under the guise of the national interests of its own country.

3. Supernational Interests. The national interests of a country may be usurped by the supernational interests in two ways-through religious bodies and international environment.

(i) *International Organisation.* Though religious bodies have ceased to be effective instruments of supra-national interests at present, the international organisations certainly operate against the national interests of the states by compelling them to pursue only such policies which do not operate against the interests of other member-states.

(ii) *The International Environment.* These exercise a profound influence on the decision makers in the formulation of a country's foreign policy. The state as a unit of the international community, is bound by certain regulations conventional, customary, ethical, legal or institutional and the framers of the foreign policy have to operate within these limitations. They have not only to keep the national interests in mind but also give due weightage to the interests of other states who are equally determined to fight for their national interests. They must keep a watchful eye on the policies and actions of other states. They must have a trace of various international developments. This implies that a state which seeks to play an active international role must take decisions according to the conditions prevailing around. It should be willing to overhaul its foreign policy according to the exigencies of time. In case it fails to do so it will be cut off from the main currents of the world affairs. This will prove that its leadership is not far-sighted. It is clear that "the major influence on foreign policy making thus derives from the fact that it is made with reference to other similarly acting bodies over which the policy-makers of the state in question have no authority or jurisdiction, and that the international arena within which policies are made is in high degree anarchical."

Asserting the need of compromising the national interests with the interests of other nations, Prof Morgenthau says "the national interest of a nation which is conscious not only of its own interests, but also of that of other nations must be defined in terms compatible with the latter In a multinational world this is a requirement of political morality, in an age of total war it is also one of the conditions for survival" Thus while formulating the foreign policy of the political leaders must keep in sight the domestic factors like geography, natural resources, industrial capacity, demography, impacts of various groups and interests in the society, strategic position of the country etc The resources available for the pursuit of the national interest are necessarily limited in quantity and kind All the states cannot promote their objectives with equal vigour Therefore the states should allocate their scarce resources as rationally as possible

QUESTIONS FOR EXERCISE

1 Define and distinguish Nation, Nationality and Nationalism

2 Define national interest and discuss its kinds

3 Explain the methods adopted for the promotion of National Interests

4 Explain the relationship between national interests and foreign policy What are the constraints of national interest ?

8

Foreign Policy

VALUE OF FOREIGN POLICY

According to Charles Burton Marshall, "The foreign policy of a state takes form in the course of action undertaken by authority of the state and intended to affect situations beyond the span of its jurisdiction."

No state can avoid its involvement in international relations. This involvement must be systematic and based on certain well defined principles. While determining there principles the states are to work within limits of its strength and realities of the external environments. Its goal is provided by the foreign policy. A state without a foreign policy will be like a ship without a rudder. It will drift aimlessly by every storm and sweep of events without any direction. Foreign policy creates a sense of purpose. It gives confidence to achieve that purpose. Prof. Taylor has so rightly said, "Foreign policy of a sort will go on so long as there are sovereign states."

APPROACHES TO THE STUDY OF FOREIGN POLICY

1. Traditional Approach. It made an effort to reconstruct the diplomacy of a particular period with accuracy and precision. It gave due attention to the major events. It sought to enlighten the present with reference to the past. It made no effort at formulation of a theory or a conceptual framework.

2. Legalistic Approach. Another approach for the study of foreign policy was based on the legal background. It involved an extensive study of International Law. It analysed external relations of states, including constitutional provisions, laws, treaties, etc. It investigated the techniques and procedures for improvement of stability of world order.

3. Descriptive Approach. It described the foreign policy of certain selected powers in the background of certain current events. These powers were selected on the basis of personal interest and bias. Sometimes efforts were made to formulate theories and establish conceptual framework.

4. The Ideological Approach. The most important approach for the study of foreign policy is ideological. It tries to analyse foreign policy as an expression of prevailing political, social and religious beliefs. It classifies

foreign policy as democratic or totalitarian, liberal or socialist, and peace loving or aggressive However, in actual practice on state is able to maintain a consistency in policy and ideology Ideology is invariably abandoned in case of a clash between ideology and national interest Hence a study of foreign policy based purely on the basis of ideology is likely to be misleading

5. *The Analytical Approach.* *It is based on the* proposition that foreign policy rests on multiple determinants, including the state's historic tradition, geographical, local, national interest and purposes and security *needs etc It holds that each state has certain permanent interests or obligations* which are more important than ideology It tries to analyse and interpret such interest It tries to explore the basic determinant of foreign policy together with multiple factors like the concepts of competing interest, the power of nations to achieve their interest, the process through which policies are adopted and implemented and the international environment within which such policies interact on each other

The Comparative Approach This approach to the study of foreign policy is of recent origin It draws inspirations from the study of comparative government Under it effort is made to study the foreign policies under different political systems with a view to make an intensive and extensive comparative analysis

Among the above approach, traditional, legalistic, descriptive, ideological, analytical and comparative, the analytical approach is most popular and has received the widest approval

DEFINITION OF FOREIGN POLICY

1. George Modelski. Foreign policy is "the system of activities evolved by communities for changing the behaviour of other states and for adjusting their own activities to the international environment" In this definition Modelski emphasises only those aspects of policy which aim at the change in the existing behaviour of the states as the primary objective of foreign policy This is wrong because foreign policy includes both the change in the existing behaviour as well as continuation of the behaviour at *different times*

2. Padelford and Lincoln "Foreign policy is the key element in the process by which a state translates its broadly conceived goals and interests into concrete courses of action to attain those objectives and preserve its interests"

3 C.C. Rodes. "Foreign policy involves the formulation and implementation of a group of principles which shape the behaviour pattern of a state while negotiating with (contracting) other states to protect or further its vital interests"

4. Prof. Charles Burton Marshall Foreign policy is "the course of action undertaken by authority of state and intended to affect situations beyond the span of its jurisdiction" Marshall emphasises two points in his

definition. First, the foreign policy generates in action. Secondly, the things acted upon in foreign policy are beyond the jurisdiction of the state. Thus the foreign policy consists of what a nation does in the world and not what it aspires to do.

5. **Prof. F.S. Northedge.** Foreign policy implies "the use of political influence in order to induce other states to exercise their laws making power in a manner desired by the state concerned: it is an interaction between forces originating outside the country's borders and those working within them."

6. **Prof. Joseph Frankel.** "Foreign policy consists of decisions and actions which involve to some appreciable extent relations between one state and others."

7. **Huge Gibson.** Foreign policy is " a well-rounded comprehensive plan based on knowledge and experience for conducting the business of government with the rest of the world."

8. **Rodee.** "Foreign policy involves the formulation and implementation of a group of principles which shape the behavior pattern of a state while negotiating with other states to protect or further its interests."

9. **Brookings Institution.** In its book *Major Problems of United States Foreign Policy 1952-53* Brookings Institution used the term foreign policy to refer to the complex and dynamic political course that a nation follows in relation to other states. According to it the foreign policy of a nation is more than the sum total of its foreign (thought out courses of action for achieving objectives), for it also includes its commitment, the current forms of its interests and objectives and the principles of right conduct that it professes.

A perusal of the above definitions of foreign policy shows that scholars have laid emphasis either on the plan of action or policy as executed. However, they all agree that the foreign policy is concerned with the behaviour of a state towards other states.

There are many objectives of a nation's foreign policy. These represent the composite desires and wishes of the articulate groups within a state that are interested in some phase of international relations. The one common denominator of all policy goals is the obligation of any politically organized group to maintain the state as an unimpaired entity. For example, towards the close of World War II, Winston Churchill met the repeated demands of British colonies for independence with the dramatic statement that he had not become His Majesty's first minister to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire. The necessity of survival is the mainspring of foreign policy. It also includes many lesser aims dependent upon its achievement. The interpretation of the concept of survival extends considerably beyond the literal connotation of "existence". It embraces certain principles underlying the selection of policy goals. Among the more important of these are the principles of maintaining the integrity of the state, promoting the interests for the economy, providing for the national security,

protecting the national prestige and developing a power potential to prosecute an offensive war if the occasion arises

1. Protection of Territorial Integrity. Foreign policy seeks to protect the territorial integrity of a country It protects the interests of its citizens, both within and outside the country For this purpose the sates prefer to follow policy of status quo If a state pursues a policy which seeks to upset the status quo it is branded as revisionist It arouses suspicion of other members of the international community for the maintenance of its prestige It has to protect the interests of its citizens both inside and outside the sate

2. Maintaining International Relations Another objective of foreign policy is the maintenance of link with other members of international community This is done by adoption of policy of conflict or cooperation towards them with a view to promote its own interest For example, India has deliberately avoided exchange of diplomatic relations with Israel so that its relations with the Arab countries do not get strained This is primarily because of close trade relations with the Arab countries

3. Promotion of National Interest. The foreign policy of a country seeks to promote its national interests The primary interest of each state if self-preservation, security and well being of its citizens When the interest of various states come in clash they have to protect their interests

4. Promotion of Economic Interests. The foreign policy aims at promotion of economic interest of the country The status of a state in international arena is largely determined by its economic status Hence the states to pursue a foreign policy which can contribute to their economic prosperity and enable it to play a more effective role in international politics Most of the treaties and agreements concluded by the states with other members of international community are essentially designed to protect and promote the economic interests of these states India opted to keep out of two power blocs,which had come into existence when she gained independence It adopted policy of non-alignment chiefly because she was keen to concentrate on her economic development She hoped to get every possible help and assistance from both the superpowers to accelerate the process of economic development Similarly despite their ideological differences USA and China were obliged to patch up their differences due to economic considerations

5. Enhancement of State's Influence. The foreign policy aims at enhancement of the influence of the state either by expanding its area of influence or reducing the other states to the position of dependence The policy of United States and Soviet Union in the post-World War II period have been largely motivated by these considerations

DETERMINATION OF FOREIGN POLICY

A. Internal Factors

1. Size. The size of a state's territory as well as its population greatly influences its foreign policy. The leaders and people of countries with small territory and population do not expect their country to carry great weight in international affairs. On the other hand, the leaders and people of large countries are ready to assume special responsibilities. However, sometime even small states which have rich resources also leave a deep impact on world politics. For example, the small in size oil-rich countries of Middle East, are playing significant role in the international politics. Similarly, if a country possesses large territory which is barren and a population which is unskilled, it may not be able to play any effective role in international politics.

2. Geography. The geography of a country includes its fertility, climate, location in relation to other land masses, and water-ways, etc., It is a major factor in determining self-sufficiency of a country. Land-locked countries, nations in the tropics and those bordering superpower are less self-sufficient in comparison to the countries which have access to warm-water ports or which are located in the temperate zones and far removed from superpowers. For example, in the nineteenth century USA adopted isolationist policy chiefly on account of its geographical location. The importance of geographic factors has considerably declined due to technological and scientific developments though acknowledged almost at all hands. For example, due to improvement in the means of transport and communication the world has greatly shrunk. The perception of large bodies of water as natural barriers to military attack has greatly diminished. However, the geographical location of a country has a deep impact on the determination of its foreign policy. Because of geographical location the presence of two major powers on its borders (USSR and China) India was deterred from joining either power bloc.

3. History. The historical traditions of a country deeply influence the foreign policy. People possessing a unified historical experience pursue an effective foreign policy due to the support of all sections of society who share the same values and memories. On the other hand, a country which is historically fragmented cannot pursue an equally effective foreign policy.

4. Culture. According to Prof. Rosenau, "The influence of cultural factors is not limited to the impact of societal unity upon the formulation and implementation of foreign policy. Equally important are the processes through which the contents of shared norms and practices of society, as distinguished from the degree of unity that supports them, shape the plans that are made and the activities that are undertaken with respect to the external world. Thus cultural factors very much influence foreign policy."

5. Economic Development. The stage of economic development which a country has attained has its impact on its foreign policy. The

industrially advanced countries feel more deeply involved in relations with other countries because they have to import different kinds of raw materials and commodities form other countries They are also on the look out of latest knowledge and technical know-how Hence they maintain intimate trade relations with their trading partners This leads to intimate links between the groups and peoples of one country with their counterparts in other countries Again, an industrial country has a higher gross national product (GNP) It can spare greater funds for external purposes, viz., economic aid programme, military ventures and extensive diplomatic commitments On the otherhand, industrially backward countries are not able to actively involve themselves in external affairs Paucity of scientists, engineers and other specialists in a country prevents them from taking advantage of the technological breakthrough abroad

6. Technology Advancement in technology affects the military and economic capabilities of a state It also exercises profound influence on the foreign policy However, this factor influences the foreign policy only in an indirect manner, viz., by influencing other sources of foreign policy

7 National Capacity The national capacity of a state exercises profound influence on its foreign policy It depends on its military preparedness, its technological advancement and economic development For example, United States which continued to pursue policy of isolation till the beginning of the present century got deeply involved in the international arena in the present century mainly due to tremendous increase in her national capacity due to rapid economic development Similarly, the foreign policy of Britain underwent great transformation in the post-World War II period, mainly due to decline in her national capacity

8 Social Structure. The social structure of a society exercises profound influence on its foreign policy A society sharply divided on the basis of wealth, religion, regional imbalances etc cannot pursue effective foreign policy on account of division and lack of co-operation among various groups On the other hand, a homogeneous society possessing strong sense of national unity may pursue a more effective foreign policy Britain stood as one person under the leadership of Churchill during the Second World War and British people gladly suffered all kinds of hardships to preserve their unity because of social solidarity Though it is not easy to trace the impact of social structure no the foreign policy plans and behaviour, because of the involved subtleties, but Rosenau points out that on student of foreign policy can "afford to ignore the external consequences of the internal social structure and of the slow changes it may be undergoing"

9. Public Mood. Public mood is an important determinant of a country's foreign policy It is generally believed that the public mood usually follows rather than guides the foreign policy making process However, it can exercise a lot of influence on the determination of a foreign policy Basic

realignment in the prevailing great power structure takes place and the state becomes more involved or more isolated form the world affairs. In an authoritarian system the public mood does not influence the foreign policy. But in a democratic system considerable weight has to be accorded to the changing public mood and sentiments.

10. Political Organisation. The political organisation in a country greatly influences its foreign policy. Under authoritarian system quick foreign policy decisions are possible as the decision making power rests with an individual assisted by his clique. But there is every possibility of a discrepancy between the psychological and operational aspects of the foreign policy as the leaders under this system are isolated form the operational environments and the subordinate policy makers provide the information which is perceived by the superiors. Further, undesirable opposition can be suppressed through censorship and promulgation of regulation. On the other hand, in a country having a democratic structure the citizens may freely express their opinion on the domestic as well as foreign policy. This leaves its impact on the foreign policy of the country. Under this system there is a very little discrepancy between what the officials want to believe about the state of world politics and the actual positions as the subordinate policy makers make available critical and detached information.

The difference in political structure within the democratic system itself has its impact on foreign policy. Under a parliamentary system of government based on co-operation between the Legislature and the Executive the cordial relations between the two wings have an impact on country's foreign policy. Under presidential system based on the principle of separation of powers, the relations between the two wings are likely to be more strained. This affects the ambiguity or continuty of foreign policy. Under biparty system and multi-party system different foreign policy is likely to emerge. Under biparty system the government has a clear cut majority and conducts itself in a more decisive manner regarding foreign relations. In contrast under multi-party system conflicting view points and interest may have to be reconciled leading either to the avoidance or postponement of the decision.

11. Role of Press. The Press plays a vital role in the foreign policy formulation process. It contributes to this process by supplying factual information on the basis of which the people take decision. This is done by publishing specialized articles on current international developments which enable the people to understand the significance of developments in their country in relation to the past developments. It is also done by analysing the policy of the government in regard to foreign affairs. The press also plays an important role in publicising the foreign policy of the country. It, however, depends on the prevailing political system, the rate of literacy as well as the attitude of the government.

12. Political Accountability. Political accountability greatly influences the foreign policy of the country In an open political system the demands of citizens and groups get articulated and transmitted to foreign policy formulators The policy formulators anticipate these demands while formulating the foreign policy On the other hand, under a closed system the public relations are neither available nor given much importance

13 Leadership Leadership plays a vital role in shaping a country's foreign policy Rosenau has said, " A leader's belief about the nature of international arena and the goals that ought to be pursued therein, his or her peculiar intellectual strengths and weakness for analysing the information and making decisions, his or her past background and the extent of its relevance to the requirements of the role, his or her emotional needs and most or other personality traits these are but a few of the idiosyncratic factors that can influence the planning and execution of foreign policy " Thus the qualities of leadership have a deep impact on the country's foreign policy However, their role is greatly constrained by the governmental and social structure Again, the role of leadership is not identical in all countries As compared to industrialised societies their role is greater in less developed countries In industrialised societies the individual enjoyed very limited discretion in high governmental and non-governmental positions

B. External Factors

In addition to the internal factors which influence a country's foreign policy a number of external factors exercise considerable influence on the foreign policy of a country The world today has become so interlinked that incidents in some countries have their immediate impact on other countries For example, a coup d'etat in a neighbouring country, or nationalisation of oil companies in middle east or release of a propeosed arms control agreement influence the actions of leaders in other counteries Following are the external factors governing foreign policy

1. Power Structure. The power structure prevailing in the wold politics greatly influences the policy of a country Three possibilities can be envisaged here Firstly, a number of powers may enjoy great power status and their relations may be based on balance of power system Secondly, there may be only two powers which dominate the world scene and the other states are compelled to side with one or the other Thirdly, more than two states attain great power status and the two powers at the poles are less able to command strict allegiance of those in the orbit Highlighting the point that the nature of power structure prevailing in the world has a substantial impact on the foreign policy of a country, Prof Rosenau says "Wherever a nation is located in the prevailing hierarchy of world politics, rules governing the conduct of its foreign relations tend to be embedded in the arrangements whereby the great powers cope with their conflicts or otherwise interact to frame and shape the major issue of an era

These rules may not be explicitly identified and their operation as imputs may take many forms, but their relevance to the deliberations of foreign policy officials is likely to be pervasive."

2. International Organisation. Contemporary international organisation also influences the foreign policy of a country. A country has to take note of the international law, treaties and contracts. While *formulating its foreign policy, no country can ignore these factors without* jeopardising its own interests. Apart from the global level, the structures at the regional and the sub-regional levels also greatly influence the foreign policy of a country.

3. Reaction of Other States. A country has to take note of the reaction of other states to its various actions while formulating its foreign policy. No country can afford to pursue interests which are against the interests of the other states. Any policy based on narrow national interests is *likely to evoke strong reaction from the concerned state and produce disastrous* consequences. For example, in 1939 unmindful of the British reaction with disastrous consequences, Hitler embarked upon the invasion of Poland. Similarly, unmindful of the strong American sentiments Japan's attack on Pearl Harbour produced disastrous effects for her.

4. Alliances. Alliances concluded by various states also influence the foreign policy. The states which are parties to alliance have to respond to the requests and demands of their allies. They have to refrain from formulating policies or taking actions which are offensive to them. Though the alliances give gread amount of independence to the plans and actions, yet implicitly and explicitly they operate as important elements in the process through which foreign policy is formulated and implemented.

5. World Public Opinion. The world public opinion also exercises profound influence on the foreign policy of a country though only occasionally. It is able to exercise influence on the foreign policy of a state only if it is supported by the domestic public opinion. For example, U.S. Government was made to change its Vietnam policy largely due to hostile world opinion.

Thus the foreign policy of a country is determined by the domestic factors as well as the international environments.

QUESTIONS FOR EXERCISE

1. Explain the value and various approaches to the study of foreign policy.
2. Define foreign policy and discuss its objectives.
3. Describe the determinants of foreign policy.
4. Discuss the various instruments of foreign policy. What are the factors influencing Foreign Policy.?

9

Diplomacy

Diplomacy consists of the techniques and procedures for conducting relations among states It is the normal means of conducting international relations Like any machinery it is neither moral nor immoral Its use and value depend upon the intentions and abilities of those who practice it It functions through a labyrinth of foreign offices, embassies, legations, consulates, and special missions all over the world

Nature of Diplomacy

Diplomacy is commonly bilateral in character But due to the growing importance of international conferences, international organizations, regional arrangements, and collective security measures, its multilateral aspects have become increasingly significant It embraces a multitude of interests, from the simplest matter of detail in the relations between two states to vital issues of war and peace When diplomacy breaks down, the danger of war, or a major crisis, is very real

Definition of Diplomacy

1. ***The Oxford English Dictionary.*** Diplomacy is "the management of international relations by negotiation," or "the method by which these relations are adjusted and managed"

2 ***Sir Ernest Satow.*** "Diplomacy is the application of intelligence and tact to the conduct of official relations between the governments of independent states"[1]

Foreign Policy and Diplomacy

The foreign policy of a state, said J R Childs is " the substance of foreign relations," whereas "diplomacy proper is the process by which policy is carried out"[2] Foreign policy is made by many different persons and agencies It is made at the highest levels, though subject to many different

1 Sir Ernest Satow, *Guide to Diplomatic Practice* (London, 1922), I, 1

2 J R. Childs, *American Foreign Service* (New York Holt, 1948), p 64

kinds of controls. The purpose of diplomacy is to provide the machinery and the personnel by which foreign policy is executed. The Foreign Policy is substance, the diplomacy is method. In his interesting study, *The Congress of Vienna,* Nicholson wrote: "It is useful, even when dealing with a remote historical episode, to consider where diplomacy ends and foreign policy begins. Each of them is concerned with the adjustment of national to international interests. Foreign policy is based upon a general conception of national requirements...Diplomacy, on the other hand, is not an end but a means; not a purpose but a method. It seeks, by the use of reason, conciliation and the exchange of interests, to prevent major conflicts arising between sovereign states. It is the agency through which foreign policy seeks to attain its purpose by agreement rather than by war. Thus when agreement becomes impossible diplomacy, which is the instrument of peace, becomes inoperative; and foreign policy, the final sanction of which is war, alone becomes operative."[3]

The last sentence in this quotation tends to destroy the distinction between diplomacy and foreign policy which Mr. Nicolson makes. It is misleading to suggest that diplomacy ceases to function when major international crises arise, especially if they lead to war. Diplomacy does not cease to function, as Nicolson suggests, in time of war; although it necessarily plays a different role in wartime. The object of diplomacy, as of foreign policy, is to protect the security of a nation, by peaceful means, if possible, but by giving every assistance to the military operations if war cannot be avoided.

Functions of Diplomats

In an address before the America-Japan Society in Tokyo, on November 22,1938, Joseph C. Grew, United States Ambassador to Japan, commenting on the work of the professional diplomat, explained the " supreme purpose and duty of an ambassador" in these words: "He must be, first and foremost, an interpreter, and this function of interpreting acts both ways. First of all he tries to understand the country which he serves— its conditions, its mentality, its actions, and its underlying motives, and to explain these things clearly to his own government. And then, contrariwise, he seeks means of making known to the government and the people of the country to which he is accredited the purposes and hopes and desires of his native land. He is an agent of mutual adjustment between the ideas and forces upon which nations act."[4]

---

3. *The Congress of Vienna : A Study in Allied Unity,* 1812-22 (New York : Harcourt, Brace, 1946), P. 164.
4. *Ten Years in Japan* (New York : Simon and Schuster, 1944), p. 262.

The role of a diplomat may be divided down into four basic functions (1) representation, (2) negotiation, (3) reporting and (4) the protection of the interests of the nation and of its citizens in foreign lands

1. Representation. A diplomat is a formal representative of his country in a foreign state He must cultivate a wide variety of social contacts, with the officials of the foreign office and of the foreign government in general, with his fellow diplomats, with influential persons in all walks of like, and with articulate groups in the country Ambassador Grew, a career diplomat of long experience, *referred to social contact as " the X-Ray language* vibrating beneath the surface of the spoken and the written word," which is a diplomat's way of saying that a trained mixer-observer-auditor can often pick up information or intelligence of great value in conversations at social functions

2. Negotiation. A synonym for diplomacy, negotiation is the pursuit of agreement by compromise and direct personal contact Diplomats are *negotiators Their duties have been described by Mr Childs, in these words* "the drafting of a wide variety of bilateral and multilateral arrangements embodied in treaties, conventions protocols, and other documents of a political, economic, and social nature Their subject matter ranges from the creation of an international security organization, through territorial changes, establishment of rules to govern international civil aviation, shipping and telecommunications, and the adjustment of international commercial *relationships, to such particular matters as immigration, double taxation,* waterway rights, tourist travel, and exchange control Almost the entire gamut " human activities is covered "[5]

3. Reporting Reports from diplomats are the raw material of foreign policy These reports range from technical studies to appraisals of the psychology of nations Diplomats mush be good reporters According to a publication of the United States Department of State on the American Foreign *Service, diplomats are expected to 'observe, analyze, and report on* political, social and economic conditions and trends of significance in the country in which they are assigned Some major subjects of these reports are legislative programmes, public opinion, market conditions, trade statistics, finance, production, labour, agriculture, forestry, fishing, mining, natural resources, shipping, freights, charters, legislation, tariffs and laws "[6]

4. Protection of Interests A diplomat is expected to get along with the authorities of the state to which he is accredited *He must be persona grata* to the government of a state However, he is also expected to seek to further

---

5 Childs, p 70

6 *The Foreign Service of the United States* Dept. of State Pub 3612, Foreign Service Series 6 (Washington, D C Government Printing Office, August 11, 1946)

the best interests of his own country at all times. It is his duty to look after the interests of his country as interpreted by the policy-makers back home and in accordance with treaties, other international agreements, and principles of international law. He has the more specific duty of attempting to assist and to protect businessmen , seamen and all other nationals of his own country who are living or travelling in the country in which he is stationed. He seeks to prevent or correct practices which might discriminate against his country or its citizens.

Classification of Diplomats and Consuls

The top positions in the diplomatic service are held by the chiefs of mission, most of whom have the rank of ambassador or minister. These however, constitute only a fraction of the total number of diplomats, most of whom are career officials or noncareer specialists. There are at least three ranks of these officials:

(1) *Counselors* of embassy or legation, who rank highest among diplomatic staff members;

(2) *Secretaries* of an embassy or legation, usually ranked as first, second, and third secretaries; and

(3) *Attaches,* who may be junior career officers or noncareer persons serving in a diplomatic capacity on a temporary basis-including commercial, agricultural, military, naval, air, petroleum, cultural, press, and other attaches.

Practice in U.S.A.

The Foreign Service Act of 1946 divided the American Foreign Service into five main categories:

(1) *Chiefs of Mission,* divided into four classes for salary purposes;

(2) *Foreign Service Officers,* the elite corps of the American Foreign Service, divided into seven classes (a top category of career ministers, plus Classes I-VI);

(3) *Foreign Service Reserve Officers* in six classes, who are assigned to the Service on a temporary basis (no more than four consecutive years);

(4) *Foreign Service Staff Officers and Employees,* in 22 classes, who perform "technical, administrative, fiscal, clerical, or custodial" duties; and

(5) *Alien Clerks and Employees,* As a result of amendments to the Foreign Service Act of 1946 there are now ten classes of Foreign Service Officers, eight of Foreign Service Reserve Officers, and ten of Foreign service Staff Officers and Employees.

Practice in U.K.

In the United Kingdom a Diplomatic Service, comprising some 6,400 civil servants, was created on January 1, 1965, to absorb the personnel in the

former Foreign Service, Commonwealth Service, and Trade Commission Service This Service has its own grade structure, comparable to the grades of the Administrative Class, the Executive Class, and the clerical Classes of the Home Civil Service

Consular Duties and Personnel

Historically, the consular service is older than the diplomatic, since it is concerned largely with two general functions which pertain to commercial and business relations and to services to nationals

1. Commercial and Business Relations

The specific duties under this function include many activities in the promotion of trade periodical and special reports, replies to trade inquiries, settlement of trade disputes, certification of invoices of goods shipped to the country the consular official represents, enforcement of provisions of treaties of commerce and navigation, and of regulations regarding plant and animal quarantine, sanitation and disinfectants, etc , protection and promotion of shipping, entrance and clearance of ships and aircraft, and other duties related to international commerce

2 Services to National

These include welfare and whereabouts cases, funeral arrangements, and settlement of estates of nationals dying abroad, services to nationals who for any reason run afoul of local authorities or violate the laws of the foreign country, protection and relief of seamen (a very special function) notarial services, services to veterans, and the like

Classes of Consuls

A Career Foreign Services ·

(1) Consuls general,

(2) Consuls,

(3) Vice Consuls of Career

B. Non Career Officials :

(1) Vice Consuls not of career; and

(2) Consular Agents

The first three classes are assigned to duties as consuls general, consuls, or vice consuls The last two may be prompted from the ranks of the clerical staff or who, may not even be citizens of the country which they represents Consuls general have supervisory powers not necessarily over a whole country but over a large consular district or several smaller districts

Diplomatic Rules and Procedures

The unwritten rules of Diplomacy are as important as the written regulations, such as those laid down in the famous Reglement of 1815, in the Convention on Diplomatic Officers and the Convention on Consular Officers adopted by the American nations at Havana in 1928, in the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations of 1961, "the first major international effort to regulate the wide field of diplomatic relations and immunities," and in the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations of 1963.

Matters of procedure and protocol have often bulked very large in diplomatic relations. "Protocol" has two meanings in diplomatic usage. It means what might be called diplomatic etiquette. In its other sense, it refers to a preliminary memorandum to be used as the basis for a later treaty or convention.

Appointment and Reception of Diplomats

Though each state appoints its diplomatic representatives in its own way, but these are generally followed by certain internationally recognized procedures. The nomination of a diplomat will be publicly announced only after the country to which he is to be sent has given its approval. The approval is called *agreement,* and the procedure of determining upon it is known as *agreation.* No country is obliged to accept a foreign representative who for any reason is *persona non grata* to it. There have been many cases in which the *agreement* has been refused.

A diplomat's formal commission is the letter of credence signed by the head of the state and addressed to the head of the state to which the diplomat is accredited. As soon as the diplomat arrives at his new post he immediately gets in touch with the foreign minister to request an audience with the head of the state to present his letter of credence. The ceremony of presentation is accompanied by the most elaborate ritual and formality. It consists of a brief speech by the envoy, and another by the head of the state as he accepts the letter of credence. Copies of both speeches are exchanged in advance so that there will be no surprise during the formal ceremony. The diplomat now confers with the foreign minister and other influential leaders of the government. He visits his colleagues of the diplomatic corps, who return his visit in due course.

Termination of a Diplomatic Mission

The termination of a diplomatic mission may come about in a number of ways:

(1) ***Resignation.*** The diplomat may, of course, resign.

(2) ***Recallor Dismissal.*** A mission may be terminated by the recall or dismissal of an envoy. He may be recalled by his own government on its own

volition, or his recall may be asked for by the government of the state to which he is accredited In the latter case, the request for his recall may be made because he has himself become *persona non grata* in the country, or because the relations between the states concerned have become so strained that recall is demanded, possibly as a preliminary to actual hostilities

Consular Officials

Consular officials must in the first instance be approved by the vernment of the state to which they are to be sent When a consular officer is appointed he receives a commission signed by the head of the state An *exequatur* is a consul's official authorization to discharge his duties at his assigned post It is "in fact an executive order of the foreign government which recognizes the official character of the consular officer and grants him the privileges or immunities conferred upon his office by treaty, law or custom and permits him to exercise his official duties "[7]

Diplomatic and Consular Privilege and Immunities

Diplomats enjoy exemption from direct taxes and customs duties, from the civil and criminal jurisdiction of the countries to which they are accredited, and in fact, from the laws of the foreign state in general They their families and the members of their staff are personally inviolable As embassies and legations are regarded part of the national territory of the states which diplomats represents, they are immune from molestation by officials of the states or the local governmental units in which the properties are actually located These privileges and immunities are extended to diplomats due to reasons

(1) Diplomats twofold are personal representatives of their heads of state and also, in effect if not in form, of the governments and hence of the people of their own countries,

(2) In order to carry out their duties satisfactorily, they must be free of certain restrictions which local laws would otherwise impose

History of Diplomacy

1 Ancient. The beginnings of organized diplomacy may be traced to the relations among the city-states of ancient Greece By the fifth century B C, Nicolson states," special missions between the Greek city states had become so frequent that something approaching our own system of regular diplomatic *intercourse had been achieved* "[8]

The Romans did little to advance the art of diplomacy by negotiation In the Eastern Roman Empire, diplomatic methods were employed with great

7 Stuart, p 246

8 Harold Nicolson *Diplomacy* (London, 1939) p 21

effect. The Eastern emperors had marked success in playing off potential rivals against each other. The reports of their representatives at foreign courts gave them information which they were able to utilize to their advantage. Their representatives were skilled diplomats and trained observers, extending the practice of diplomacy to include accurate observation and reporting as well as representation.

2. Medieval. Until the late eighteenth or early nineteenth century diplomacy more often meant the study and preservation of archives than the act of international negotiation. This concept was especially prevalent in the Middle Ages.

3. Modern. (i) The Beginning. Modern diplomacy as an organized profession originated in Italy in the late Middle Ages. Machiavelli's *The Prince* described in masterful fashion the rivalries of the Italian city-states and the methods which their rulers used to promote their interests. The Holy See was the first to utilize the system of permanent representation characteristic of modern diplomacy. The first known permanent mission was established at Genoa in 1455 by Francisco Sforza, Duke of Milan. During the next century Italian city-states established permanent embassies in London and Paris and at the court of the Holy Roman Emperor. A British ambassador was assigned to residence in Paris, Francis I of France "devised something like a permanent diplomatic machinery."

Diplomacy was still the diplomacy of the court. Its object was to promote the interests of the sovereign abroad by various means, direct or devious, fair or foul; and standards were low and ill-defined. The ambassador, was deemed to be the personal representative of his chief of state in a foreign country. An affront to him was an affront to the chief of state himself and hence to the nation that he symbolized. In the absence of well-defined rules of procedure, frequent disputes arose from questions of precedence and immunity. Ambassadors often found themselves in dire financial straits, especially if the sovereigns whose dignity they were trying to enhance by sumptuous display neglected to pay them salaries.

(ii) The Seventeenth Century. Diplomacy had become an established profession and a generally accepted method of international intercourse. The rise of nationalism and the nation-state system made some such machinery essential.

(iii) Eighteenth Century. In the eighteenth century the diplomacy of the courts entered its golden age. The game came to be played according to well-understood rules, with a great deal of glitter on the surface and much incompetence and intrigue beneath. Diplomats represented their sovereigns. They were the willing tools in the great contests for empire and for European supremacy that were waged in the century.

(iv) Late 18th Century By the late eighteenth century the Industrial, American, and French revolutions had ushered in a new era of diplomacy It imposed far more complicated duties on the diplomat, to attempt to represent a nation rather than ruler, and to attempt to feel the pulse of a people rather than of the king alone It called for a new king of diplomat However, the so-called democratic diplomacy was still carried on by representatives of the aristocracy of wealth and often of rank

(v) Rules by Congress of Vienna To place diplomacy on a more systematic and formal basis, the congress of Vienna laid down certain rules of procedure which are still commonly observed These rules were embodied in the Reglement of March 19,1815, and in regulations of the Congress of Aix-la-Chapile in 1818 The diplomatic hierarchy consisted of four ranks or classes of representatives (1) ambassadors, papal legates, and papal nuncios, (2) envoys extraordinary and ministers plenipotentiary, (3) ministers resident, later merged with the second rank, and (4) charges d'affaires The order of priority within each rank was based on the length of service in that country rather than or the more subjective basis of the relative importance of the sovereign on country the diplomat represented The ambassador senior in terms of length of service in a country was the *doyen* or *dean* of the diplomatic corps in that country

CONDITIONS OF THE NEW DIPLOMACY

In his book *Diplomacy* Harold Nicolson has called attention to three developments of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries which greatly [illegible] the theory and practice of diplomacy These were (1) the "growing sense of the community of nations," (2) the "increasing appreciation of the importance of public opinion," and (3) the "rapid increase in communications"[9] The first two developments enlarged the diplomat's functions and enhanced his importance As the number of international organizations, groupings, and conferences increased, multilateral diplomacy took on added significance Today the policy makers of all nations are very sensitive to currents of public sentiment One of the main functions of diplomatic representatives is reporting on the attitudes of the people in the countries to which they are accredited

The third development, the rapid increase in communications, reduced the status of diplomats and opened up more convenient channels of international negotiation It became possible for the foreign minister or head of the government to direct virtually all important negotiations He may bypass the regular diplomatic representatives Diplomacy by conference, and other multilateral procedures became more and more popular

---

9 *Ibid.* p 70

DEMOCRATIC DIPLOMACY

"Democratic diplomacy" seemed to symbolize a new order in world affairs in which governments were fast losing their aristocratic leanings and their aloofness, and peoples were speaking to peoples through democratic representatives and informal channels. Though diplomacy remained a rather esoteric profession, carried on by men of wealth and influence and power, it was conducted with the assistance of a growing number of career officers, the elite guard of diplomacy, whose standards of competence and training were being steadily raised.

Dangers of Democratic Democracy

Experience in democratic diplomacy has been disappointing. It has been associated with the diplomacy of he market place, or even plebiscitary diplomacy. In book *Diplomacy* Nicolson calls attention to some of the evils of democratic diplomacy:

1. Irresponsibility. The first and "most potent source of danger", he declares, "is the irresponsibility of the sovereign people".

2. Ignorance. It arises not so much from a lack of facts as from the failure of the ordinary citizen "to apply to the general theory of foreign affairs that thought and intelligence which he devotes to domestic matters." In other words, foreign affairs are too *foreign* to the citizens of a state, and their implications are not adequately grasped.

3. Partial Information. Even more dangerous than ignorance, "are certain forms of popular knowledge.." The willingness of partially informed people to make quick and positive conclusions and judgments on even the most complex issues of foreign policy is a constant source of embarrassment to those who must weigh all the evidences and accept responsibility for the eventual decisions.

Two other serious dangers in democratic diplomacy, according to Nicolson, are :

4. Limitation. In a democracy public opinion sets the limits within which the foreign policy of the country must operate. It may prevent the leaders of a nation from taking positive action at the opportune moment and thereby may hamper the effectiveness of diplomacy as "the first line of defence."

5. Delay. Democratic states have often been criticized for following policies of "too little and too late", and the failure to act in time often seems to have caused greater crises at a later date. Leaders of democratic nations seldom launch foreign policies, until and unless they are reasonably confident of popular understanding and support.

6. Imprecision. In Nicolson's words Imprecision suggests the "tendency of all democracies to prefer a vague and confirming formula to a precise and binding definition " Diplomats were trained to be masters of double talk. The language of diplomacy, as well as its ritual and practice, became incomprehensible to the uninitiated When diplomats were allowed to make public addresses they were encouraged to say as little as possible but in the most pleasing fashion The "language of politeness," stilted and circuitous was much preferable to the "language of the fishmarket" in which many diplomatic exchanges, are now conducted As K M Panikkar, a skilled Indian scholar diplomat, remarked, the "language of politeness" was "fully understood by the persons to whom it was addressed," whereas today 'the language of diplomacy has become abusive and is addressed over the heads of governments to the masses "

Demand for Open Diplomacy

In the popular mind Democratic diplomacy came to be associated with open diplomacy Secrecy was held to be incompatible with true democracy The Congress of Berlin of 1878 represented a high-watermark of the practice of secret diplomacy The demand for open diplomacy reached a climax at the time of the First World War It was given classic expression in the first of Wilson's famous Fourteen Points, as presented in his message to Congress of January 8, 1918 "Open convenants of peace, openly arrived at, after which there shall be no private international understandings of any kind but diplomacy shall proceed always frankly and in the public view "

The principle of open diplomacy was embodied in the Convenant of League of Nations and later in the Charter of the United Nations It was based on a well-founded distrust of secret diplomacy and a naive misconception of the nature and functions of diplomacy Those who decry the evils of secret diplomacy usually mean that the secrecy but not the diplomacy should cease Some have expressed the view that "open convenants" are certainly desirable but that they can hardly be "openly arrived at " Even Wilson said, "When I pronounced for open diplomacy, I meant, not that there should be no private discussions of delicate matters, but that no secret agreements should be entered into, and that all international relations, when fixed, should be open, above board, and explicit "

Assessment of Democratic Diplomacy

Democratic Diplomacy became a dominant trend only after the First World War It has been largely responsible for the decline of diplomacy, including Waler Lippmann, Harold Nicolson, Hans Morgenthau, and Sisley Huddleston Many observers argue that the prospects for world peace are dim unless there can be a return to some of the traditions and practices of more conventional and less public diplomacy Huddleston regarded post-World

War.I diplomacy as infinitely worse as the very negation of real diplomacy. He said, "We must return to the more discreet and competent methods of professional diplomacy". He insisted, and abandon "the limitless idiocies of popular diplomacy". but, he stated, "nothing short of a miracle will enable us to bring about those reforms in diplomatic practice which might prevent popular diplomacy from continuing its fatal trend toward world ruin."[10]

The shortcomings of democratic diplomacy lie in the formulation of policies and in their implementation. Democratic processes serve the people best when they make it possible to hold leaders to a strict accountability for results and objectives but not to an obligation to negotiate on the television screens of a million homes and bars.

TOTALITARIAN DIPLOMACY

Totalitarians invoked doctrines of racial superiority, mysticism, materialism, and militarism in furtherance of their ends. Diplomacy was used as an instrument of national policy. In doing so they degraded its language and its practice. Diplomats became agents of conquest, double-dealing, and espionage. Their business was not to work for peaceful international relations but to provoke dissension rather than understanding to make the leaders and peoples of other nations weak and blind and divided in the face of the growing totalitarian menace. As Lord Vansittart complained, the object of totalitarian diplomacy, "is thoroughly calculated to create and maintain *bad* relations."[11]

Diplomatic representatives of totalitarian states used most of the established rules of procedure. They, however, conformed to the generally accepted standards of internationai conduct only when it suited the schemes of their masters. Modern dictators openly boasted that treaties and other international obligations. The Germans and Russians used their embassies as centres of espionage in Canada, Great Britain, the United States, and Latin America.

Negotiations with representatives of totalitarian at international conferences and in foreign capitals frequently degenerated into endurance contests, usually ending in complete frustration. Agreements were violated, in spirit or in letter, or in both, or evaded by unilateral definitions which destroyed the essence of the "understanding."

After repeated rebuffs in the field of diplomacy, the democratic nations finally realized that appeasement of a Fascist state only whetted its appetite. In the postwar period, frustrations in diplomacy led to the cold war and a generally unhappy state of international relations.

10. Huddleston, pp. 256,261.

11. "The Decline of Diplomacy," *Foreign Affairs*, XXVIII (January, 1950), 179. Italics in original.

DIPLOMACY BY CONFERENCE

In the postwar period states have had increasing resort to "diplomacy by conference" International conferences proliferated as never before It became really popular after the First World War under the stimulus of the League of Nations and the quest for regional and collective security Since World War II it has become so common as to constitute a new development in international relations

Important Conferences

The First great conferences of modern times were those which ended the Thirty Years' War and led to the Peace of Westphalia of 1648 Representatives of France and the Catholic states of the Holy Roman Empire met in Munster, and representatives of Sweden and the Protestant states of the Empire in Osnabruck These two conferences, which lasted more than four years, finally produced two treaties, collectively known as the Treaty of Westphalia In the nineteenth century important conferences were held in Vienna (1814-15), Paris (1856), and Berlin (1878) The most famous of all twentieth century conferences was the Paris Peace Conference of 1919, besides the Washington Conference of 1921, the Locarno Conference of 1925, and the Geneva Disarmament Conference, which met intermittently from 1932 to 1937 During World War II several major conferences brought the leaders of the allied countries together for consultation and major decisions The San Francisco Conference, opened before V-E Day and Closed before the surrender of Japan, drafted the Charter of the United Nations

Six to ten thousand sessions of international conferences are now held each year Some deal with highly technical subjects and are attended by experts in their fields Others are general international meetings, attended by hundreds of persons, including many foreign ministers or diplomats of the highest rank Most numerous of all are the conferences held under the aegis of the United Nations and its agencies, which now sponsor more than five thousand meetings each year

Importance of Conference Diplomacy

Diplomacy by conference meets a real need The term "Diplomacy by Conference," incidentally, goes back at least to 1920, when Lord Hankey used it as the subject of a lecture Lord Maurice Hankey, a member of Lloyd George's War Cabinet, wrote in 1946 that this type of diplomacy had come to stay and that the 'best hope" for the prevention of war "appears to lie in the judicious development of diplomacy by conference"[12] "My personal experience," he added, "is that the most important elements of success in diplomacy by con-

---

12 Lord Maurice Hankey, *Diplomacy by Conference* (New York G P Putnam's Sons 1946), pp 38 39

ference are elasticity of procedure, small numbers, informality, mutual acquaintance and if possible, personal friendship among the principals, a proper perspective between secrecy in deliberation and publicity in results, reliable secretaries and interpreters."[13] On the other hand, former U.S. Secretary of State Dean Acheson pointed out that in the postwar years the international conference has to a large extent "ceased to be an instrument for ending conflict and has become one for continuing it. ....In Short, the international conference has been so used for political warfare that it is not likely to be useful now, except for registering, and for getting peripheral consent to, adjustments reached elsewhere, when adjustment is possible."[14]

PERSONAL DIPLOMACY

1. Summit and Near-Summit Diplomacy. In recent years the direct participation of foreign ministers, prime ministers, and even heads of states in diplomatic negotiations has become increasingly common. During the several personal meetings between Churchill and Roosevelt, beginning with the rendezvous in August, 1941 major and fateful decisions about the war and the postwar international order were made. It resulted in the Atlantic Charter. The conferences of Churchill and Roosevelt with Chiang Kai-shek at Cairo (November, 1943), and with Stalin at Teheran (December, 1943) and at Yalta (February, 1945) were followed by the Potsdam Conference of July-August, 1945. The main participants were Churchill (replaced by Attlee after the General Elections of July), Stalin, and Truman. The "Summit" conference in Geneva in July, 1955 was the only postwar meeting at this level. It was attended by the President of the United States and the prime ministers of France, the United Kingdom, and the U.S.S.R. Frequent meetings of prime ministers of Asian and African countries were held either by an exchange of visit on a bilateral basis. Their major international conferences, were the Asian-African Conference at Bandung in 1955, and the conferences of nonaligned states in Belgrade in 1961 and in Cairo in 1964. African prime ministers and heads of states have frequently participated in conferences held under the auspices of the Organization of African Unity.

In the fall of 1943 and again in December, 1945 the foreign ministers of the Big Three of the war period-the U.S.S.R. the United Kingdom, and the United States— held an important meeting in Moscow. They met several times in the postwar period together with the foreign minister of France. The Council of Foreign Ministers attempted to draft peace treaties for the defeated Axis states. They met again in Berlin in February, 1954, to resolve the deadlock on

---

13. *Ibid.,* pp. 37-38.

14. "Meetings at the Summit : A Study in Diplomatic Method," address at the University of New Hampshire, May 8, 1958.

German unification They met in Geneva in October, 1955 to consider the same question, along with the problems of European security, German rearmament, disarmament, and other pressing issues The American secretary of state and the foreign ministers of Great Britain and France met on numerous occasions to discuss matters of common interest As a result of the "New look" in Russia they continued to hold consultations in the more relaxed international atmosphere The opening sessions of the United Nations General Assembly and top-level meetings of various regional arrangements and organizations, provide opportunities to foreign ministers to meet and exchange views

2 **Personal Agents.** Heads of states have often relied on personal representatives to handle delicate problems in international relations Henry *Wriston's study of Executive Agents in American Foreign Relations* shows that they have been employed in American diplomatic relations since colonial times *The Intimate papers of Colonel House* and Robert Sherwood's *Roosevelt and Hopkins* provide excellent case studies of this type of diplomacy

3. **Direct Approach.** Churchill and Roosevelt developed direct approach to their opposite numbers in other countries to a fine art, especially by use of the transatlantic telephone They also corresponded directly, or sent messages to each other by personal emissaries and confidants When in England on wartime missions Harry Hopkins often spent [illegible] with Churchill He was therefore able to convey Roosevelt's [illegible]ews and get Churchill's in return with a maximum of frankness and a [illegible] of formality On the eve of Pearl Harbor, Roosevelt tried to appeal directly to the Emperor of Japan to do his best to avert war The Japanese answer was delivered by Japanese planes over Pearl Harbor The personal diplomacy of Churchill and Roosevelt led to some unfortunate results in their dealings with Stalin

Advantages of Personal Diplomacy

1 In an increasingly interdependent world it is useful for top leaders to meet their counterparts in other countries It will provide opportunities for fruitful exchange of views and more realistic assessments of the character and concerns of other leaders

2 Such meetings can help to remove misunderstandings between nations and to clear road blocks to international agreement

3 Heads of states, prime ministers, and foreign ministers gain experience in international diplomacy which makes them aware of the realities of international life

Disadvantages of Personal Diplomacy

1. Having many responsibilities and preoccupations top leaders do not have time to participate in tedious international meetings and to prepare adequately for them.

2. The function of the top officials of a state is policy-making, not negotiation— a task that should be left to professional diplomats.

3. Personal diplomacy on the highest level, or the use of personal favourites in more delicate negotiations, is often characterized by incompetence. It is based on subjective considerations which may affect the vital interest of a state. "The practice," complained Lord Vansittart, "is an essay in omniscience, and it is only sometimes successful, because everyone needs advice."[15]

4. To Harold Nicolson it indicated a misunderstanding of their functions and of the important distinctions between foreign policy and diplomacy. Foreign ministers should keep to policy-making, leaving the work of negotiation to the professional diplomatist.

5. Visits of an accredited representative to the foreign office, unlike those of a foreign minister, "arouse no public expectation, inspire no Press indiscretions, and if sterile lead to no public disappointment."[16]

6. Sisley Huddleston said, "In foreign affairs, in particular, a president, a prime minister, or any other high functionary of the state entrusted with the most vital responsibilities, should, first and last, make, as it were, an abstraction of himself."[17]

Dean Acheson remarked : For high international negotiation, whether or not in conferences, it is not necessary that chiefs of state or heads of government be involved. Indeed, it is better that they should not be. The makers of ultimate decisions must be insulated a little from the negotiators themselves. They must remain more detached. Neither their prestige nor their judgment should be caught up by the ebb and flow of the struggle in the negotiating chamber.[18]

---

15. Vanisttart, p. 187.
16. Nicolson, *Diplomacy*, p. 101. Secretary of State Dulles was a firm believer in the kind of personal diplomacy permitted by his peripatetic propensities. His Democratic critics spoke of him as an "unguided missile," and scholars too felt that Dulles was too much of the time up in the air or abroad.
17. Huddleston, p. 230. Huddleston's relevant chapter bears the unequivocal title, "The Menace of Intimate Top-Level Conferences."
18. "Meetings at the Summit : A Study in Diplomatic Method," address at the University of New Hampshire, May 8, 1958.

However, some experienced diplomats disagree with the views given above Lord Hankey, believes that the solution of difficult problems may require "resources beyond those of the most competent and qualified diplomatist" He contends that some questions can be settled only in conferences by persons who, along with other qualifications, are "alone in a position to make real concessions" and that "now a days, when governments are often responsible to parliaments elected on the widest franchise, it is no longer advisable to rely entirely on intermediaries"[19]

PROPAGANDA AND DIPLOMACY

In old diplomacy a diplomat must not attempt to interfere in any way in the internal affairs of the country to which he was accredited The new diplomacy has developed various instruments and techniques of formal and informal penetration The use of propaganda through the radio, the press, and other methods in becoming a commonplace approach In the words of George V Allen, former Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs propaganda has become "a conscious weapon of diplomacy"[20] Mr Allen admits that propaganda is not a new technique "The Duke of Wellington doubtless addressed messages to Napoleon through the press of his day, and Cyrus the Great probably started bizarre rumours for his purposes" Woodrow Wilson's famous Fourteen Points, were enunciated, not through diplomatic channels but in a message to Congress

Allen has thus described the campaign of the State Department's to deliberate intervene in the Italian elections of 1948

By press, motion picture, and radio we tried our level best, through open propaganda methods, to persuade the Italian voter that democracy, although offering no immediate paradise, was a surer method of progress [than communism] The Voice of America transmitted short-wave radio programmes in the Italian language every day, beamed toward the people of Italy, extolling the advantages of democracy Americans of Italian origin were encouraged to write to their relatives in Italy, counselling them to vote democratic We arranged for American newsreels, showing the American way of life and American aid to Italy, to be shown in every Italian theatre for several weeks prior to election day[21]

Much of Fascist and Nazi diplomacy was conducted through propaganda The Russians have been adept in this techniques In the Italian elections of 1948, Radio Moscow was even more vocal than the Voice of America

---

19 Hankey, p 38

20 George V Allen address at Duke University, Durham North Carolina, December 10, 1949, *Department of State Bulletin* XXI (December 19,949), 941-943

21 *Ibid*, p 942

One cannot deny the magnitude of the propaganda activities of the governments of modern states, especially totalitarian states and all major powers. The new and intimate connection between propaganda and diplomacy has altered the nature of the relations between states. It has undoubtedly weakened diplomacy in the traditional sense. Yet in an age of mass communications, of growing literacy, and of bitter war for the minds of men, it seems inevitable that propaganda will rise as "a conscious weapon of diplomacy."

NEW DIMENSIONS IN DIPLOMACY

Broadening of Diplomacy

(1) The increasing incidence of public multilateral negotiations; (2) the expansion of diplomatic activity into the cultural and educational fields; and (3) the multiplication of informal channels of contact among peoples and nations.

Parliamentary Diplomacy

Kenneth W. Thompson has pointed out, a "novel, revolutionary and worldwide institutionalizing of diplomacy."[22] It has led to the growing importance of what has been called "parliamentary diplomacy." It is a type of multilateral negotiation which, as Dean Rusk has explained, involves "a continuing organization," a "regular public debate exposed to the media of mass communication," "rules of procedure which govern the process of debate," and "formal conclusions, ordinarily expressed in resolution." "Typically, we are talking about the United Nations and its related organizations, although not exclusively so, because the same type of organization is growing up in other parts of the international scene."[23]

Plebiscitary Diplomacy

"Diplomacy," wrote James Reston in 1958, "which started in the royal court, and moved then to the cabinets of world governments, has moved once more into the headlines of the world's press. It is a bad way to conduct diplomacy."[24] This way can lead to the excesses of "plebiscitary diplomacy."

Extending Dimensions of Diplomacy

Diplomacy is no longer confined to political and economic relations, or to relations between governments and top political representatives. Its

---

22. *American Diplomacy and Emergent Patterns* (New York : New York University Press, 1962), p. 203.
23. "Parliamentary Diplomacy-Debate vs. Negotiation," *World Affairs Interpreter*, XXVI (Summer, 1955, 121-22.
24. "The Narcotic Force of Tricky Slogans," *New York Times*, January 12, 1958.

activities now embrace he whole field of educational and cultural relations Diplomacy is not just governments dealing with government, but also peoples speaking to peoples

The dimensions of diplomacy have also been widened by "the rapid growth of informal relations between states," a development which is new in scope although not in essence

QUESTIONS FOR EXERCISE

1 Define diplomacy and distinguish between old and new diplomacy

2 Discuss the relationship between the international relations and diplomacy

3 "Diplomacy is the management of international relations negotiations the method by which these relations are adjusted and managed by ambassadors and envoys the business and art diplomatist" Elucidate

4 How does diplomacy differ from foreign policy? Discuss

5 Discuss the relative advantages and disadvantages of diplomacy under democracy as distinguished from diplomacy under absolutism

6 It has been stated that the increase of democracy greatly interferes with diplomatic work How far do you subscribe to this view?

"The most distinguishing characteristic of the post-world war has been the change from age-long bilateralism to multilateral diplomacy and it appears humanity has now pinned its faith on International Organisations to solve the age-long riddle of World Order and Peace"

8 Define 'diplomacy by conference' How far do the United Nations procedure reflect this process?

10

Role of Ideology

MEANING OF IDEOLOGY

A. Ideology as cluster of ideas

One of the features which distinguishes the contemporary world policies from the classic pattern is the central role of mass beliefs and popular ideas in the affairs of states. In the twentieth century Nazism and Fascism in Germany and Italy respectively led to war in 1939. Communism from its base in Russia has become one of the major focus of the present age. Democracy has opened new and exciting vistas of individual worth and free societies to much of the human race. Anti-colonialism has transformed the political map of the world and drastically changed the conditions of international policies. It can be very well said that the 20th century is an ideological era.

1. Charles P. Schleicher. "*Ideology is a system of abstract ideas held by* an individual which purports to explain reality, express value goals and contain programmes of action for the retention of attainment of the kind of social order in which its proponents believe the goals can be best realised." It follows that a particular individual may and ordinarily does adhere to several ideologies—nationalism, socialism, neutralism, and Gandhism, etc.

2. Synder and Wilson. "Ideology is a cluster of ideas, about life, society or government which originate in most cases as consciously advocated or dogmatically asserted, social, political or religious slogans or battle cries and which through continuous usage and preachment, gradually became the characteristic beliefs or dogmas of particular groups, party or nationality.

3. Padelford and Lincoln. "Ideology is a body of ideas concerning economic, social and political values and goals with positive action programmes for attaining those goals."

4. Martin Seliger. "An ideology is a group of beliefs and disbeliefs expressed in value sentences, appeal sentences and explanatory statements. These sentences refer to mortal and technical norms and are related to the descriptive and analytical statements of fact with which they are arranged and together interpreted as a doctrine bearing the imprint of centrality of morally founded

prescribes A doctrine which is to say in ideology, presents a not entirely self consistent not fully verified and verifiable but not merely distorted body of views These views relate in the main to forms of human relationships and socio-political organisation as they should and could be and refer from this perspective to the existing order and *vice versa* Ideologies share with others some morally and factually based views and thus at test ideological pluralism without thereby losing their distinctiveness

B Ideology as Power

In the second sense the term ideology is used for power

1 Prof Morgenthau It is the very nature of politics to compel the actor on the political scene to use ideologies in order to disguise the immediate goal *of his action As the immediate goal of political action according to Morgenthau* is ability to control actions of others the ideology is merely a means for the attainment of this objective

2 Prof Karl Mannheim The particular conception of ideology is implied when the term denotes that we are sceptical of the ideas and representation advanced by our opponent They are regarded as more or less conscious disguise *of the real situation the true recognition of which would not be in accord with* his interest these distortions range all the way from conscious lies to half conscious and unwritten disguises from calculated attempts to dupe others to self deception

Out of these two views about the meaning of ideology, the second one has by and large come to be accepted by the modern scholars

CLASSIFICATIONS OF IDEOLOGY

Morgenthau has classified ideologies as follows

1 Ideologies of Status Quo If a state pursues policy designed to preserve the *status quo* it is regarded as the adherent of *status quo* ideology Such states hold great faith in international law and peace They are opposed to all types of imperialism They have faith in system of collective security and mutual assistance to ensure that the world peace is not disturbed They seek to protect the interests of smaller states so that *status quo* is not disturbed A state which has acquired significant portion of territory of other states through force cannot be regarded as adherent of the ideology of *status quo because all the time these* states have to face resentment of other states

2. Ideologies of Imperialism As opposed to the ideologies of *status quo* ideologies of imperialism seek to create an international *system which* redistri butes the power in their favour These ideologies do not hold faith in international law They seek to disturb the *status quo* to promote their own interests Adhering *to this ideology, Hitler of Germany* severely condemned Treaty of Versailles which sought to preserve the *status quo* and advocated

imperialist policies.

3. **Ambiguous Ideologies.** There are ideologies whose premises are not clear and are used by various states for their respective purposes. One of the best examples of this ideology is offered by 'principle of national-self determination' advocated by President Wilson during the First World War. This principle was used to dismember the Austria Hungarian empire by the allies. But Hitler used it to swallow Austria and part of Czechoslovakia.

MODERN IDEOLOGIES

1. Liberalism

This is also known as ideology of freedom and world peace. It was quite popular during the seventeenth century. In fact it formed the basis of the western social, religious, economic and political system. It regarded the individual as supreme and laid emphasis on development of his talents and capacities to the maximum. It laid emphasis on free competition and paid great attention to the welfare of the individual. In the international sphere this ideology emphasises the principles of peace, friendship freedom, co-operation, justices etc. It is opposed to intervention in the domestic affairs of other states. It has faith in peaceful co-existence of all states irrespective of their position or status. In the words of Vernon Van Dyke, "Faced with a choice between guns and butter, the liberal is inclined to choose butter, perhaps to the peril of his nation. Faced with a choice between appeasement and resistance to a foreign threat at the risk of war, the liberal may be inclined towards appeasement, for war threatens most of the values he holds dear In recent decades, particularly, the liberal democracies have been very reluctant to engage in military preparations and to participate in war."

Prof. Schelicher has highlighted the salient characteristics of Liberalism as follows:

1. **Welfare.** It is conducive to the practices which promote the welfare of men regardless of their social, economic, racial or national status.

2. **Dignity.** It seeks to promote individual dignity not only of its own nationals but of all people in general.

3. **Sovereignty.** It does not permit sovereignty to stay in the way of protection and promotion of human rights and other democratic values.

4. **International Institutions.** It favours international institutions where men shall have right to take part in important decisions affecting them and find peaceful solutions.

5. **Peaceful settlement.** It favours pacific settlement of disputes and peaceful changes in accordance with the will majority.

The above principles are emphasised by all those who believe in liberal ideology. However, they considerably differ in the actual application of these

principles Further, they have conveniently used these principles to justify their acts of omission and commission Even the formation of various military alliances has even justified on the ground that this aims at the preservation of democracy which is threatened by the communists The adherents of liberal ideology attach equal importance to the economic interests and security of their country They are not willing to sacrifice the same for the sake of above principles

2. Totalitarianism

This ideology is opposite of liberalism It attaches more importance to the state rather than the individual It draws a clear line of demarcation between the ruler and the ruled It asserts the right of the elites to government It does not attach any importance to the freedom of speech and association as instruments of popular welfare It holds that state alone can promote the welfare of people Other important features emphasised by this ideology are one-party government, constant expansion of state and omnipotence of state war as an instrument for settlement of disputes etc Fascism, National Socialism and Communism are some of the important totalitarian ideologies The Fascism under Mussolini attached a mystical quality to the state It wanted the power to be left in the hands of an elite led by a single superman, regimentation of social, economic, political and intellectual activities of people, territorial expansion and war as an instrument for settlement of international disputes, subordination of individual to state, etc Socialism under Hitler not only emphasised the above principles but also put forth principle of racial superiority of the Nordic people

Communism stands for a free and dignified life of the individual through elimination of system of exploitation of man by man, different from both Liberalism and Totalitarian ideologies in so far as it stands for a world revolution It views state as a class organisation, an instrument of the nomination of one class by the other It anticipates a stage when the state will 'wither away' and the principle 'for each according to his ability, to each according to his need' will be realised Marxism predicts two stages of socialism—first phase in which production is socialised under proletarian dictatorship and a final phase when stateless society would usher in Here Marxism-Leninism insists on the destruction of the bourgeois state machinery through a violent revolution and establishment of the proletarian dictatorship It asserts that the present system of capitalism has lost its usefulness in the national sphere In the international sphere it has led to the system of imperialism which possesses inherent contradiction which shall manifest themselves in the form of struggle for national emancipation The ultimate aim of communism is to see triumph of world socialism

Ideological Confrontation

In the post World War II conflict ensued between Liberalism (Democracy) and Communism (Totalitarianism) Both aimed at destroying each other In

course of time both these ideologies underwent a change. They abandoned their intention to destroy each other. Failure to bring about proletarian revolution in advanced industrial states greatly undermined the communist ideology. On the other hand the unsuccessful attempts by the capitalists to destroy the Bolshevik edifice compelled them to reconcile with the changed situation. Thus both the ideologies underwent great transformation. Due to fear of losing ground to communists, the capitalist states started dismantling their colonial empires. They embarked upon socialist policies after 1953. Thus both Communism and Democracy ceased to be orthodox doctrines and were involved in competitive rather than peaceful existence.

ROLE OF IDEOLOGY

There is a difference of opinion among scholars regarding the impact of ideology on international relations. Emphasising the role of ideology in international relations Prof. Norman Hill said that it is a simplifying mechanism that offers to individual ready-packaged ideas and therefore, obviates the necessity for him to work out answers for himself. The easiest course is to accept without question the package handed to him to become a Communist if he lives in Russia where Communism is the approved system, to uphold the ideas of democracy if he has been raised in the Western World, to be a German militarist if he has been brought up in Germany or a French nationalist if his backgrounds has been French. Whatever a person may be, he is surrounded by isms to which he rather naturally succumbs without much, if any mental effort. To be sure, some people are sufficiently assertive intellectually to work out for themselves something other than packaged ideas but the rank and file take the easier course."

Other scholars have contended that ideology does not play that effective role in international politics. If certain powers are able to move men and destroy and create society, it is more on account of their power rather than their ideology. The ideology merely give direction to the physical resources of the countries.

1. Value of Public Opinion. The truth lies between these two extreme views. Though it may be too much to say that ideology plays a vital role in international politics, but it cannot be denied that it exercises considerable influence on international relations. For example, during the inter-war period, Fascism in Italy and National Socialism in Germany considerably influenced the foreign policies of these countries and their relations with other countries. In the modern times ideology has become more important since a large number of people have begun to play an effective role in the formulation of foreign policy at decision making level. No doubt, the general public does not exert a continuous, direct and positive influence over decision-making, yet public opinion limits the scope of alternatives available to the decision makers. The policy markers try to mould the public opinion in support of their policies by

not allowing the information to reach the people and indoctrinating them with the ideas favourable to them This is particularly true of totalitarian states E H Carr has highlighted this point that in democratic states effort is made to control the though He says, "Prior to 1914 the conduct of international *relations was the concern of the person professionally engaged in it In* democratic countries, foreign policy was traditionally regarded as outside the scope of party politics, representative organs did not feel themselves competent to exercise any close control over mysterious operation of foreign of offices"

2. Justification to National Policy. Ideology provides justification and rationale to the policy of a country It provides goals for political actions concealing all manifestations of a struggle for power

3. Both Cooperative and Oppositional Role. While common ideology unites the states, the opposite ideology divides them sharply The ideology of nationalism has divided the mankind into small groups opposing each other Nationalism impels a country to assert that its cause is absolutely just while that of the opponent is unjust The states are not willing to concede a remote *possibility that there can be a measure of justice and a measure of injustice* on both sides

4. Framework for Foreign Policy. Ideology provides a rigid framework *for the foreign policy makers It results in* "faulty thinking characterised by assumptions of doubtful validity, disregard for the meaning of words and definitions, misrepresentations of facts, omissions of facts, general conclusions n from specific premises or conclusions based on only one premise, s on the basis of insufficient data, conclusions drawn *per analogiam* without due regard for differences impairing the overall validity of the analogy, disregard for the time elements and disregard for the laws of thinking *in general*"

5. Ideology and Struggle for Power. There is a definite relationship between the ideologies and struggle for power In the words of Prof Morgenthau "All *politics— domestic or international is nothing* but struggle for power and *true nature of the policy is concealed* by ideological justifications and rationalisations" Instead of using the ideology in explaining objectives for the realisation of which political power is needed, the ideology merely provides a mark behind which the ulterior motives are concealed

6. Linked to National Power. The significance of ideology in international politics has been brought out by Prof Palmer and Perkins thus "The significance of ideologies in world politics today lies in the fact that in some instances they have become linked to national power Just as power became the instrument of ambitious nationalism it has now become the tool of ideologies Without power of *some kind of* ideology even one which aspires to universalism is a passive harmless pattern of related ideas What makes

Communism the dread of the world is not the gospel of Marx and Lenin, it is Soviet (and Chinese) power associated with and sustaining the Communist ideology. Without power Communism would be an important psychosis." They further assert, "Ideologies, in fact, are futile source of international conflict, and they greatly complicate the task of the peaceful solution of all conflicts." Further, "Ideologies are essentially irrational, they have a considerable emotional content, they can be used to obscure the real facts of a situation or the real motives of ambitious leaders; they can be appealed to by extremists and then can make reasonable approaches and compromises difficult or even impossible; they frustrate efforts to find areas of agreement, they make it hard to deal with international problems without undue sacrifice of national honour or prestige; they turn international conferences into propaganda forums instead of opportunities for the accommodation of diplomacy."

Decline of Ideology

Prof. Daniel Bell holds that the ideological fires in the Western World have cooled down and 'ideology' which was once the road to action, has become a dead end. Most of the disputes which still persist between different countries such as dispute between India and Pakistan, the Arab states and Israel etc are not ideological in character, even though they may be projected in ideological terms. Likewise the dispute between Soviet Union and China can hardly be described as an ideological dispute Differing from this view Palmer and Parkins argue that "in many countries it may be true that political ideas and ideologies have lost their old appeal, but in international politics this seems to be less true." At present the above view of Palmer and Perkins does not seem to be valid. The growing co-operation between the super powers, despite ideological differences, is a clear proof that in recent times ideology has lost its relevance and the different ideologies are on decline. The current detente between Soviet Union and USA has virtually put an end to the ideological tension. In most of the East European countries, the Communists have been ousted from power and there is a trend towards liberalisation. Berlin wall and the division of Germany, which symbolised ideological division, have since come to an end. Thus, it may be concluded that ideology has ceased to be an important factor in international relations.

QUESTIONS FOR EXERCISE

1. Explain the meaning of ideology and give its classification.
2. "Most international conflicts show a mixture of power politics and ideological factors." (S. Friedmann). Discuss with two illustrations from the post-war period.
3. "Ideology is probably the most important factor that effects the international milieu." Do you agree?

11

The Balance of Power and Power Vacuum

National power is the most important of all controls in interstate relations. It can be used for peace-keeping of peace making as well as for warm making It is the only effective instrument for checking aggression The balance of power involves the utilization or arrangement of national power in a special way

International relations require balance of power, collective security, procedures for peaceful settlement, international law, and international organization as *institutionalized approaches to the control of interstate relations* Other rather intangible measures include moral convictions, humanitarianism, pacifism, toleration, enlightened self-interest and many other ways of thinking in favour of peace

HISTORICAL REVIEW

The period of the theory and practice of the balance of power started shortly after 1500 Its rise to prominence coincided with the emergence of the nation-state system and the Age of Discoveries It became a cardinal feature of international relations after the Treaty of Westphalia of 1648 As Quincy Wright pointed out, "While other factors have had an influence, the concept of the balance of power provides the most general explanation for the oscillations of peace and war in Europe since the Thirty Years' War "[1] The classical period of the European balance of power system ranged from 1648 until the end of the Napoleonic era in 1815[2]

In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries the principle of the balance of power was most *fully applied It was written into several treaties of the* eighteenth century It is a basic principle in international relations Under

1 Quincy Wright, *A Study of War* (Chicago University of Chicago Press, 1942) II, 758

2 Edward V Gulick, "Our Balance of Power System in Perspective" *Journal of International Affairs* XIV (1960) 10-11

present conditions it operates far less efficiently and satisfactorily than in previous centuries. But one may agree that "the idea of 'balance of power' is still the central theoretical concept in international relations."[3]

Meaning of Balance of Power

As Inis L. Claude has observed, "The trouble with the balance of power is not that it has no meaning, but that it has too many meanings."[4] By consulting a good dictionary Professor A.F. Pollard, concluded that there were several thousand possible meanings of the phrase, as analyzed word by word.[5] Essentially balance of power is "equilibrium" of the type represented by a pair of scales.

Definitions of the Balance of power

1. Georg Schwarzenberger. It is an "equilibrium" or "a certain amount of stability in international relations" that under favourable conditions is produced by an alliance of states or by other devices.[6] It "is of universal application wherever a number of sovereign and armed States co-exist."[7]

2. Hans Morgenthau. It is "only a particular manifestation of a general social principle."[8]

3. G. Lowes Dickinson. "It means, on the one hand, an equality, as of the two sides when an account is balanced, and on the other hand, an inequality, as when one has a 'balance' to one's credit at the bank." He added, significantly, that "the balance of power theory professes the former, but pursues the latter."[9]

4. Sidney B. Fay. "It means, such a 'just equilibrium' in power among the members of the family of nations as will prevent any one of them from becoming sufficiently strong to enforce its will upon the other."[10]

---

3. Glenn H. Snyder, "Balance of Power in the Missile Age," *Journal of International Affairs*, XIV (1960), 21.
4. Inis L. Claude, Jr., *Power and International Relations* (New York Random House. 1962), p. 13.
5. "The Balance of Power," *Journal of the British Institute of International Affairs*, II (March, 1923), 51-64.
6. Georg Schwarzenberger, *Power Politics*, 2nd rev. ed. (New York · Frederick A. Praeger, 1951), p. 178.
7. *Ibid*, p. 181.
8. Hans J. Morgenthau, *Politics Among Nations*, 3rd ed. (New York Alfred A. Knopf, 1960), p. 167.
9. *The International Anarchy*, 1904-1914 (New York . Century, 1926), pp. 5-6.
10. Sidney B. Fay, *Encyclopaedia of Social Sciences*, (New York The Macmillan Company, 1937), p. 395.

5 *Hans J Morgenthau* He used the term in four different senses (1) as a policy aimed at a certain states of affairs (2) as an actual state of affairs (3) as an approximately equal distribution of power (4) as any distribution of power but he added that whenever the term is used without qualification it refers to an actual state of affairs in which power is distributed among several nations with approximate equality'[11]

Characteristics of the Balance of Power

1 **Equilibrium** History is subject to constant ceaseless change to shifting political patterns and power relationships to disequilibrium Equilibrium theory is concerned among other things with international disequilibrium as well as with equilibrium[12]

2 **Temporary and Unstable** As Deutsch and Singer pointed out No balance of power system has lasted longer than a few centuries and most of the original powers contending in such systems have survived as independent powers only for much shorter periods[13]

3 **Acquired Balance of Power** According to Nicholas J Spykman is not a gift of the gods but is achieved by the active intervention of man[14] Spykman added states must be willing to go to war to preserve a balance against the growing hegemonic power of the period

4 **Tends to favour the status quo** However history reveals that a policy which disregards the forces making for change is doomed to eventual failure To be effective a balance of power policy must be changing and dynamic

5 **Unpredictability** It is difficult for a nation to tell when a balance of power has been achieved A real balance of power can seldom exist The only real test is that of war and resorting to war upsets the balance It creates the very conditions which a balance of power policy is supposedly designed to prevent

6 **Both Objective and Subjective in Approach** Martin Wight says that The historian takes the objective view whereas the statesman takes the subjective The historian will say that there is a balance when the opposing groups seem to him to be equal in power The statesman will say that there is a balance when he thinks that his side is stronger than the other And he

---

11 Morgenthau *Politics among Nations* p 167 n 1

12 George Liska *The International Equilibrium* (Cambridge Mass Harvard University Press. 1957)

13 Karl W Deutsch and J David Singer Multipolar Power Systems and International Stability *World Politics* XVI (April 1964) 403

14 Nicholas J Spykman *America's Strategy in World Politics* (New York Harcourt Brace 1942) p 25

will say that his country *holds* the balance, when it has freedom to join one side or the other according to its own interests."[15] Statesman's is the more realistic approach. As Spykman has declared, "the truth of the matter is that states are interested only in a balance of power which is in their favour. Not an equilibrium, but a generous margin is their objective."[16]

In *A Study of War* Professor Quincy Wright wrote "Each of the powers ... especially the great powers, has been interested not only in preserving but also in augmenting its relative power; consequently, there has never been wholehearted devotion to the balance of power principle among them. Each statesman considers the balance of power good for others but not for himself. Each tries to get out of the system in order to "hold the balance" and to establish a hegemony, perhaps eventually an empire, over all the others."[17]

7. Not Primarily a Device for Preserving the Peace. There is some point to the claim that the balance of power system "in the final analysis rests upon war."[18] It leads to war as in order to prevent an upsetting of the basic balance The primary purpose of the balance of power is to maintain the independence of states, and not to preserve the peace.

8. It is for the Great States. Although small states are vitally concerned with the balance of power, they are at best spectators, rather than players. As Spykman observed, "unless they can successfully combine together," they "can only be weights in a balance used by others."[19] Collectively, they may be able to exert some influence upon the most powerful states Individually, they may be important factors in regional balances. They may try to maintain their independence or improve their bargaining positions by exploiting great power rivalries and conflicts of interest.

9. Suitable neither for democracies nor for dictatorships. A democracy is a reluctant player and a poor leader in the balance of power game. A dictatorship, on the other hand, is usually interested in dominating the contest, by establishing rules to suit its own convenience, and by gathering in all the rewards.

10. Inoperative Under Present Conditions. With the expansion of the state system to an international scale it is impossible for any nation or international organization to play the role of balancer. The nuclear and space age has relegated balance of power techniques to diplomatic history: At best "the balance of power is not suitable to our era beyond its function as a transitional device."[20]

---

15. *Power Politics* (London, 1946), p. 46.
16. Spykman, p. 21.
17. Wright, II, 757-58.
18. Gulick, p. 18.
19. Spykman, p. 20.
20. Gulick, p. 19.

The Role of Balancer.

Even for the great powers, the risks are great and the outcome uncertain in the balance of power A great power may be holder of the balance, and not a major participant in the balance itself

By virtue of her sea power, her semi-detachment from the Continent, her industrial and political strength, her astute diplomacy, and other factors, Britain was able to develop an effective balance of power policy and to act as a real balancer of the European states in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries But the rise of new great powers on the continent of Europe and in America and the Far East in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries ended her enjoyment of this unique position No real balancer exists at the present time It is doubtful that any nation can hope to succeed to England's former role under modern conditions

Bipolarity

In the absence of a balancer, balance of power policies have tended towards the polarization of power around the strongest members of rival alliances or groupings It was a central feature of international politics in the years following World War II The Soviet Union and the United States, at opposite poles and dominating "satellite" and allied nations, created a balance which was the most dangerous and unstable form of the balance of power

The tendencies of polarization in the balance of power have led to the establishment of a new balance by the intervention of outside states, beginning a new cycle of rivalries and wars In the words of Quincy Wright "The balance of power having reached a state of polarization within a given situation, each faction tries to draw in states from the outside As a result, when economic and social contacts have sufficiently progressed, a larger balance of power, dominated by states of a different civilization, has developed around the original area The states of the original area, even though utilizing more advanced military techniques, remain divided by historic animosities and are unable to defend their civilization as a unit Consequently, the civilization is overwhelmed The disintegrating Holy Roman Empire was the cockpit for wars of all Europe in the seventeenth century Europe, still intent upon its balance of power, has been and promises to continue to be the cockpit of wars involving the United States, Japan, Russia, and the British Empire With a world balance of power established among these states, this process can no longer continue without interplanetary wars "[21]

Multipolarity

DeWitt C Poole said that a good balance of power must be complex [22] A complex or multiple balance existed when the principle was most effective,

21 Wright, I 382-383

22 "Balance of Power," *Life*, September 22, 1947, p 77

as on the continent of Europe in the eighteenth century. The transformation of the present bipolar balance into a multiple balance in the future is already underway. The stark bipolarity of the immediate postwar years seems to be yielding to a more complex balance. Polycentrism is a marked feature of politics within and without the Communist world.

Non-Alignment

Recently has Asia entered the balance of power picture in any significant way. Communist China, independent India, and Japan, are playing major roles in international politics. Several other Asian states, including Indonesia, Pakistan, the Arab states as a group, and Turkey, are influential in the councils of the nations. Several Asia states are deliberately trying to follow policies of "non- alignment" or "independence" in world affairs. Through the Organization of African Unity and the Asian-African Group in the United Nations more than 35 independent African states are playing definitely role in the existing world balance of power. These nations, as well as those of Latin America, comprise a Third World that is contributing to the evolution of a more complex balance of power.

A more complex balance of power, however, is not necessarily more conducive to international stability and peace than a bipolar balance. As Karl Deutsch and J. David Singer pointed out, "If we are chiefly interested in rapid de-escalation—that is, in partial or complete disarmament—a multipolar world may prove more intractable than a bipolar one." Moreover, "A Multipolar world, though often more stable in the short run than a bipolar one, has its own problem of long-run political stability." On the other hand, "If we are merely concerned ... with preventing any rapid escalation of the two-power arms competition between the United States and the Soviet Union, a shift towards a multipolar world may appear preferable." Furthermore, "both in the short and long run the instability of tight bipolar systems appears to be substantially greater. It seems plausible that, *if the spread of nuclear weapons could be sowed down or controlled,* a transition from the bipolar international system of the early 1950's to an increasingly multipolar system in the 1960's might buy mankind some valuable time to seek some more dependable bases for world order.[23]

Historical Significance of Balance of Power Concept

Historically, the concept of the balance of power was successful in Europe from the sixteenth to the nineteenth century. When it was then extended to a world scale after 1815 it proved to be less than adequate. Even in its heyday in Europe, it was, as Robert Strausz Hupe pointed out, "but one of the many delicate balances" that regulated the equilibrium.[24]

---

23. Deutsch and Singer, pp. 403, 406.
24. *The Balance of Tomorrow* (New York : G.P Putnam's Sons, 1945), p. 22.

EVOLUTION OF THE BALANCE OF POWER

The Ancient Support

In multiple state system the concept of the balance of power existed everywhere It was known and applied in the ancient world in the city states of Greece and also in Egypt Babylonia India and China In his famous essay Of the Balance of Power David Hume called it a prevailing notion of ancient times As he explained the maxim of preserving the balance of power is founded so much on commonsense and obvious reasoning that it is impossible it could altogether have escaped antiquity where we find in other particulars so many marks of deep penetration and discernment If it was not so generally known and acknowledged as at present it had at least an influence on all the wiser and more experienced princes and politicians [25]

Recognized and exalted Balance of power principles in theory and in practice well before the beginnings of the Christian era Hindu rulers and commentators Heinrich Zimmer referred to balance of power as the principal Hindu formula for the management of foreign alliances and coalitions The *mandala* or circle of states Kautilya s *Arthasastra* a political classic of perhaps the fourth century B C describes theory of the ancient Hindus which may be characterized as a version of the balance of power theory [26] Chinese statesmen also spoke in terms of the balance of power [27]

Medieval Rejection

Thus the term balance of power may be regarded as one of the oldest in international relations theory But its importance declined sharply with the coming of the Roman world state It did not mean much during the confused period that followed the decline and eventual collapse of the Roman Empire or in the Middle Ages in general Its idea was foreign to scholastic thinkers As Quincy Wright said it scarcely existed anywhere as a conscious principle of international politics before 1500 [28]

The Real Beginning in 15th Century

The real beginning of the balance of power system dates from the late fifteenth century The first explicit statement of the doctrine is

---

25 Devid Hume *Essays and Treat ses on Several Subjects* (London 1788) 1 305

26 Kautilya s *Arthasastra* translated by Dr R Shamasastry 5th ed (Mysore 1956) pp 344-48

27 *Ssu yu Teng* and John K Fairbank *China s Response to tl e West* (Cambridge Mass Harvard University Press 1945) pp 29 33

28 Wright, II 758

usually credited to Bernardo Rucellai (1449-1514), brother-in-law of Lorenzo de Medici.[29] It was further elaborated by Niccolo Machiavelli (1469-1527), whose classic essay *The Prince analyzed* the methods employed by successful princes in the city-states of northern Italy.

Wide Application in 16th Century

In the sixteenth century the concept of the balance of power was applied on a wider scale. It has been a key to European politics. To quote Morgenthau, "the alliances Francis I concluded with Henry VIII and the Turks in order to prevent Charles V of Hapsburg from stabilizing and expanding his empire are the first modern example on a grand scale of the balance of power operating between an alliance and one nation intent upon establishing a universal monarchy."[30]

In the sixteenth century England followed a balance of power policy between France and the Holy Roman Empire.

Writing during the reign of Queen Elizabeth (1558-1603) the famous English philosopher Francis Bacon, analyzed the doctrine of the balance of power. In his essay *"Of Empire"* he pointed to some of its essential features.

Seventeenth Century

The Thirty Years' War (1618-48) can be analyzed from the point of view of the balance of power. Cardinal Richelieu, sought a balance in favour of France.

As The Treaty of Westphalia of 1648 firmly established the nation-state system, the balance of power began to play an even greater role than before. When the ambitions of Louis XIV of France (1643-1715) threatened to destroy the balance, he faced a series of wars against various coalitions of powers.

Eighteenth Century

The Treaty of Utrecht of 1713, closed the War of the Spanish Succession. Its provisions for the division of the Spanish inheritance between Bourbons and Hapsburgs were made *ad conservandum in Europa equilibrium.* This was the first formal incorporation of the doctrine of the balance of power in an international agreement.

In theory as well as in practice the period from the Treaty of Utrecht (1713) to the first partition of Poland (1772), has been acclaimed as the golden age of the balance of power. Most of the literature of the balance of power

29. Carl J. Friedrich, *Foreign Policy in the Making* (New York : W.W. Norton & Company, 1938), p. 123.
30. Morgenthau, p. 188.

appeared during that periods The princes of Europe accepted the principle of balance of power for their guidance in the conduct of foreign affairs

During this period a multiple balance of power existed, involving England, France, Prussia, Austria, and Russia

The eighteenth century produced a prolific literature on the balance of power Many British writers and statesmen including Edmund Burke and David Hume, and the elder and younger Pitts testified to its merits Continental writers paid less attention to the doctrine, and ascribed less merit to it However several important rulers, notably Frederick the Great, wrote about it as well as practiced it

Nineteenth Century

During this period, the Allies formed one coalition after another, but Napoleon seemed able to shatter them all Finally, British sea power and finances, combined with the nationalism that Napoleon himself had evoked in Europe, brought Allied success and the restoration of the balance of power The famous Congress of Vienna of 1814-15, sought to establish a new balance of power in Europe

The interest of statesmen in the extension of the balance of power to include areas outside the major European states was also disclosed by the intervention of the great powers in the politics of the Balkans Austria, France, and Great Britain banded together in 1854, declaring "that the existence of the Ottoman Empire in its present extent, is of essential importance to the balance of power among the states of Europe " The Crimean War followed Later, the Congress of Berlin of 1878, forced Russia to revise the Treaty of San Stefano which she had imposed upon defeated Turkey at the close of the Russo-Turkish War of 1877-78.

A new multiple balance of power existed on the continent of Europe with the Concert of Europe and its related alliances and arrangements. Two of the most brilliant practitioners were Metternich in the first half of the century and Bismarck in the latter part

Challenge and Criticism

While the doctrine of the balance of power was being cherished and practised its assumptions were being seriously challenged The political philosophers of the Manchester school in Great Britain espoused *laissez fair*, non-imperialist, and often pacifist ideals John Bright and Richard Cobden, repeatedly condemned the balance of power as a mechanical and almost satanic doctrine In his Political Writings Cobden declared that " the balance of power is a chimera! It is not a fallacy, a mistake, an imposture— it is an undescribed, indescribable, in comprehensive nothing, mere words, conveying to the mind not ideas, but sounds "[31]

31. *Political Writings* (New York Appleton, 1867), I 258

Twentieth Century

After the completion of the Triple Entente by the Anglo Russian understanding of 1907 Europe was divided into two armed camps—that of the Triple Alliance and that of the Triple Entente. England had been forced to abandon her role of balancer, and to become a member of one of the rival alliances. Nevertheless English statesmen continued to follow balance of power policies, although they often eschewed them in theory.

In the interwar period, from 1919 to 1939, the balance of power doctrine was still followed, although in theory it conflicted with the search for collective security and with the principles underlying the League of Nations. It proved stronger than collective security, inside or outside the League. It provoked a series of alliances and counter—alliances, military preparations and rivalries which eventually broke down in aggression and war. After World War II, conditions seemed to be peculiarly unfavourable for the operation of the old system. However, the balance of power still remains a basic concept in international relations.

DEVICES FOR MAINTAINING THE BALANCE OF POWER

1. Alliances and Counter-Alliances. These have been the most commonly employed devices of the balance of power system. Whenever one nation threatened the balance in Europe, other states formed coalitions against it. *Ad hoc* or temporary alliances of a constantly shifting character have been standard practices in modern European history.

Alliances are often distinguished as offensive and defensive. Both are concerned with the balance of power. An offensive alliance seeks to upset the balance in favour of its members while a defensive alliance aims at restoring the balance in favour of the states which make up the alliance.

2. Compensations. It usually entails the annexation or division of territory. Territorial compensation have frequently been made by strong powers at the expense of weaker ones, and almost invariably by victor nations at the end of a war. They were employed on a larger scale during the great age of the new imperialism, from 1870 to 1914. When compensations do not relate directly to territorial areas, the principle is the same. "The bargaining of diplomatic negotiations, issuing in political compromise," for instance, as Morgenthau stated, "is but the principle of compensations in its most general form, and as such it is organically connected with the balance of power."[32]

3. Armaments and Disarmament. In theory, a more stable balance of power could be created by ending armament races and by proportionate

32. Morgenthau, p. 180.

reduction of armaments by rival powers Although repeated efforts have been made to achieve reductions in arms Washington Naval Treaty of 1922, was limited in application and duration The kinds of disarmament proposed from time to time are quantitative and qualitative disarmament, arms-building holidays, revision of the rules of war, even moral disarmament or "moral rearmament" The results of all of these well-intentioned efforts have been disappointing As Salvador de Madariage suggested, "The problem of disarmament is not the problem of disarmament It is really the problem of the organization of the World Community "[33] It is the problem of the maintenance of the balance of power

4. Intervention and Non-intervention These devices have been employed by countries in the position of balancer, most often Great Britain Intervention may range from slight deviations from neutrality, to full-scale military participation in a major war Nonintervention suggests the kind of policy usually followed by small states and also by those great powers which are satisfied with the political order and can follow peaceful methods to preserve the balance Talleyrand rightly remarked "non-intervention is a political term meaning virtually the same thing as intervention" It is particularly emphasized by small states seeking means of protection or even of survival in a world dominated by great powers It has been a cardinal principle of the inter-American system in recent years It has been repeatedly espoused by statesmen of the newly emerging nations of Asia and Africa, following varying forms and patterns of nonalignment

5. Buffer States. Without buffer zones and neutral areas, and with the rival powers in direct contact with each other, the balance of power is especially precarious in a bipolar world This situation prevails today despite signs of a trend toward a more complex balance Buffer states are of great importance because of their cushioning effect between great powers They may be neutral or neutralized states, satellite states, or dependent territories They may be actively associated with one of two or more aggregations of power in a relatively honourable role

6. Divide and Rule. A time-honoured policy, this is not necessarily associated with the balance of power It was employed by the Romans to maintain their control over scattered peoples It was used by imperialist nations to keep native populations in subjection But it has also been a device of the balance of power system For example, the traditional policy of France *vis a-vis* Germany and the historic policy of England towards the Continent and the policy of the Soviet Union towards the rest of Europe

33 *Disarmament* (New York Coward-McCann 1929), p 56

COLLECTIVE SECURITY AND THE BALANCE OF POWER

A system of collective security has been visualised as a pattern of international relations which is able to dispense with the balance of power. If the nations are bound together in an international organization or association, and if they really cooperate to preserve the peace there will be no need for alliances, burdensome armaments, shady territorial deals, political manipulations and rivalries, instability, or war. All these are inherent in the balance of power system. Quincy Wright rightly asserted that "the relations of the balance of power to collective security have, therefore, been at the same time complementary and antagonistic."[34] Wright believed, "Collective security must rely upon a balance of power which maintains such general stability that a localizing of policing actions is possible."[35]

The three outstanding examples of systems of collective security in modern times have been the Concert of Europe, the League of Nations, and the United Nations.

1. The Concert of Europe. The idea of a "Concert of Powers" was entertained for centuries and prompted many earlier experiments in international cooperation. The alliance system which emerged from the Congress of Vienna was called the Concert of Europe. It was a loose relationship among the major European powers which came into being soon after the Napoleonic Wars and lasted until World War I. Thus during one of the periods of the most successful operation of the balance of power, it was a controlling mechanism in Europe. Within its broad framework the states of Europe played the power game according to traditional rules. The Concert helped to prevent major conflicts on the Continent or in peripheral or colonial areas. It was most successful in dealing with the Balkan area. It succeeded for several decades, in localizing wars in the Balkans, and in resolving the conflicting interests of the great powers there without resort to war. The Congress of Berlin of 1878 subjected the Concert of Europe to a critical test. In the late nineteenth century, the Concert collapsed, as its foundations had not been seen as secure as its proponents had fancied.

2. The League of Nations. Woodrow Wilson and other founders of the League of Nations hope that it would provide a system of international cooperation and collective security which would supplant the balance of power. In the second of his Four Principles of February 11, 1918, Wilson expressed his firm conviction that "peoples and provinces are not to be bartered about from sovereignty to sovereignty as if they were mere chattels and pawns in a game, even the great game, now for ever discredited, of the

34. *Ibid.*, II, 781.

35. Quincy Wright, *Problems of Stability and Progress in International Relations* (Berkeley : University of California Press, 1954), p. 106.

balance of power "[36] The League concept implied universality, yet the United States and several smaller nations refused to join Germany and Soviet Russia were not allowed to do so until a later date The League functioned haltingly even in major political disputes, and proved impotent in the face of flagrant acts of aggression by powerful member states Locarno Pacts, and the Kellogg-Briand Pact of 1928, proved to be no more than momentary stimulants to collective security

The League's impotence and inadequacies became painfully evident with the rise of Hitler to power in Germany, and the succession of open challenges by the totalitarian aggressors, beginning with Japan's invasion of Manchuria in 1931 It had never actually supplanted the balance of power, except in theory It had become involved in a peculiarly unstable balance Collective security had failed to find a path out the maze of the balance of power

3. The United Nations. While the Allied powers were waging war against the Axis in World War II, they also layed the foundations of a new international organization The United Nations which they set up was in many respects a stronger organization Some features, however, tended to weaken it as an instrument of collective security, for example, the great powers were given a privileged status and through use of the veto in the Security Council they could paralyze almost any action that the UN might wish to take Again the Charter sanctioned and even encouraged steps for "individual and collective self-defense" outside the UN (Article 51), and it approved regional arrangement which could buttress but could also, in effect, bypass the UN (Articles 52-54)

Like the League of Nations, the United Nations was launched with high expectations on the part of many of its founders

Like the League, it was based on the sovereignty of the members of the nation-state system, and did not operate in a vacuum It was profoundly affected by contemporary international society, and by the nature of great power relations The UN is likewise involved in a balance of power situation since many aspects of the foreign policies of the great powers seem to operate outside the UN

INTERNATIONAL LAW AND THE BALANCE OF POWER

Thus Quincy Wright rightly concluded that "the relations of the balance of power to collective security have been at the same time complementary and antagonistic "

L Oppenheim called the balance of power "an indispensable condition of the very existence of International Law " "A law of nations," he argued,

36 Ray S Baker and William E Dodd eds, *The Public Papers of Woodrow Wilson War and Peace* (New York Harper 1927) I 631

"can exist only if there be an equilibrium, a balance of power, between the members of the Family of Nations ... . As there is not, and never can be, a central political authority above the sovereign States that could enforce the rules of the Law of Nations, a balance of power must prevent any member of the Family of Nations from becoming omnipotent."[37] Many authorities on international law are obviously thinking of a stable balance. They are assuming that international law would have to continue to operate in a world of sovereign states. But most present-day students believe that international law must move out of an era in which balance of power considerations are predominant and into another era in which really effective international organization and genuine collective security will exist. As Quincy Wright insisted, "International law ... tends to convert the system of balance of power into a system of collective security."[38]

Balance of power considerations would by no means be neglected. Even in an international society in which law predominated over politics. Wright said, "The difference between a world regime of law and a world regime of power politics, is not that the latter rests on balance of power and the former on union of power, but rather that the latter rests on a simple balance and the former on a complex balance." Hence, "if a law-governed world is to develop peacefully from the present situation, statesmen must seek to make the balance more complicated."[39]

THE BALANCE OF POWER TODAY

Unfavourable Conditions. After the French Revolution conditions became less favourable for the successful adjustment of a balance among nations. These condition were : nationalism, industrialism, democracy, mass education, new methods and techniques of warfare, the growing importance of public opinion, developments in international organization and international law, the growing economic interdependence of nations and peoples in a shrinking world, the disappearance of colonial frontiers, the emergence of many new nations, the advent of the nuclear and space age. All these conditions made the balance of power at once too simple and too difficult a policy in our contemporary world.

According to Wright, other conditions unfavourable to the operation of balance of power are : (1) the confusing bipolar-multipolar pattern of power at the present time and the disappearance of the balancer of the system; (2) the sudden, although perhaps only temporary, increase in the power of the offensive over the defensive, and the character and the frightening

---

37. Oppenheim, I, 93-94.
38. Wright, *A Study of War II*, 765.
39. Wright, *Problems of Stability and Progress*, pp. 270, 271.

implications of total war— implications which would make even the most ruthless proponent of the balance of power hesitate before taking the risk of precipitating a worldwide struggle to right the balance, (3) the growing importance of ideological considerations and other less tangible but nevertheless important elements of power, and (4) the increasing disparities in the power of states, with the superpowers becoming more and more powerful and the lesser states becoming weaker, at least in relative terms [40] As Professor Inis L Claude Jr observed, "In short all the most fundamental tendencies affecting the political realm in recent generations run counter to the requirements of a working system of balance of power There is nothing to indicate that the global setting is likely to become more rather than less appropriate to the operation of a balance system "[41]

The UN as Balancer In 1949 Quincy Wright wrote "The UN, with all the great powers participating may succeed as a balancer where the League of Nations failed If the UN should itself develop sufficient independent power to serve as balancer, the conditions for decentralization of power might exist If the UN could act as a balancer even though its independent power is inadequate to enforce its own law, it might reduce the intensity of the rivalry between the United States and the USSR so that other regions of the world could organize independent power thus further stabilizing the equilibrium "[42]

This possibility seems so remote as to be hardly worth considering Unfortunately, the UN has not been able to play the more vigorous role in world politics ' There seem to be not much prospect that the UN can ever play such a role As an instrument of the nation state system it lacks the power, authority, and status to be an effective regulator or balancer of an international system which still rests more on balance of power considerations than on considerations of genuine collective security or genuine supranationalism

POWER VACUUM

Use of Vacuum Theory

In recent years international relations have come to be completely dominated by two superpowers These two superpowers have tended to strengthen their hold over areas from which the other smaller powers were obliged to withdraw They have justified their actions on the basis of 'vacuum theory ' The concept of 'power vacuum' has been in practice since the post

---

40 Wright, *A Study of War II* 760 66 859 60

41 Claude pp 92 93

42 ' Modern Technology and the World Order " in William F Ogburn ed *Technology and International Relations* (Chicago University of Chicago Press 1949) pp 192, 193

Second World War period. It was given a definite shape by the United States in the wake of British decision to withdraw East of Suez. United States with a view to justify her naval presence in the Indian Ocean put forth this theory. It argued that a complete withdrawal from the Indian Ocean "would lead to dangerous power vacuum over a vast and volatile area which the US and Britain's other allies would find extremely difficult to fill, a vacuum that would serve neither Britain's long term interest nor its stake in world peace and stability." The Americans argued that if they did not move into the Indian Ocean, the vacuum would be filled by the Russians. Thus the United States put for the vacuum theory to justify the entry of US forces into the area.

Opposition of Vacuum Theory

The vacuum theory did not find favour with India and other major littoral states of the area. For example, during her visit to some South-East Asian countries in May 1966 Mrs. Indira Gandhi said that the withdrawal by the British did not create any vacuum, and if at all it did so, it should be filled by the local Powers and not by outsiders. On 10 April 1968 Mr. Swaran Singh firmly rejected this theory in the Lok Sabha. He said, "Government do not accept the validity of the proposition that a vacuum will be created in the Indian Ocean on the British decision to withdraw from the areas east of Suez." He refused to accept the validity of the concept that any vacuum may be created and said : "If any foreign power leaves any particular area, then it is for that area and for that territory to take adequate steps to safeguard their own safety and their own country." He further asserted that "the withdrawal of any political power or any outside military presence in any part of the world is something which we greatly welcome. It is for the countries and the region concerned to take appropriate measures for their safety."

Implementation of Vacuum Theory

Though the American Congress did not approve the 'power vacuum' theory, the U.S. Defence Department continued to increase its naval presence in the region. It went on insisting on the need for a permanent military presence in the Indian Ocean. In 1964 an Anglo-American team made a joint survey of the Indian Ocean to select islands for military bases. Following modifications in Britain's plan to withdraw completely from the Indian Ocean in 1965 USA co-operated with Britain in the creation of British Indian Ocean Territory (BIOT) for the construction of defence facilities by the British and the US governments. USA entered into a contract with Britain and acquired the right to use it as a base for 50 years. It is significant that USA penetrated into the area with the help of the local allies. For example, a day before the British control was to end in the Persian Gulf, the Shah of Iran, at the instance of Britain and America, sent his troops to occupy Tumb and Abu Musa Islands, which controlled approaches to the Hormuz Strait. He also despatched troops to the Sultanate of Oman to crush the anti-imperialist movement in Dhofar and

established control over the southern shores of the Hormuz Strait A little later the Sultan signed a secret treaty with USA permitting it to establish bases in Masirah, on the approaches to the Oman Bay U S A had established control over all the main entrances to the Indian Ocean by the beginning of the Seventies It had established control over Simonstown, at the entrance of the Atlantic Ocean, Masirah which served as an approach to the Persian Gulf and Diego Garcia which commanded central position in the Indian Ocean, and Malacca Straits which controlled what was the most important route from the Pacific through their political proximity to the ASEAN countries Thus USA converted the Indian Ocean into an American Lake

QUESTIONS FOR EXERCISE

1 Define Balance of Power and explain its characteristics

2 Explain the present position of Balance of Power

3 What are the devices for maintaining Balance of Power

4 How is International Law related to Balance of Power? Is U N O a balancer?

5 Write short note on Power Vacuum

12

Imperialism and Colonialism

IMPERIALISM

Definition of Imperialism

1. **Moritz Julius Bonn.** "Imperialism is a policy which aims at creating, organizing, and maintaining an empire; that is, a state of vast size composed of various more or less distinct national units and subject to a single centralized will."[1]

2. **Charles A. Beard.** "*Imperialism* is ... employment of the engines of government and diplomacy to acquire territories, protectorates, and/or spheres of influence occupied usually by other races or peoples, and to promote industrial, trade, and investment opportunities."[2]

3. **Parker T. Moon.** "Imperialism ... means domination of non-European native races by totally dissimilar European nations."[3]

It will be seen that Bonn imposed a quantitative measurement and presumably ruled out the possibility of a "small imperialism." Beard excluded all except economic motivations, and he made direct government action an inseparable part of imperialism. Moon injected the test of racial difference. The definitions of Hans Morgenthau, Joseph Schumpeter, E.M. Winslow, and Lenin suggest additional qualifications. Morgenthau scrapped the conditions of exclusive economic motivation, size of operation, and difference of race; he defined imperialism altogether in terms of the expansion of a state's power beyond its borders.

4. **Schumpeter.** Imperialism is an atavistic force, ancient in inception, decadent and self-conscious in an age of rationalism, yet still powerful enough to lord it over its rival, the upstart capitalism.

---

1. Moritz Julius Bonn, "Imperialism," *Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences* (New York : The Macmillan Company, 1937), VII, 605.
2. Charles A. Beard, *American Foreign Policy in the Making, 1932-1940 : A Study in Responsibilities* (New Haven : Yale University Press, 1946), p. 113n.
3. Parker T. *Moon, Imperialism and World Politics* (New York : The Macmillan Company, 1926), p. 33.

Characteristics of Imperialism

1 As Subjective Term "imperialism" is a highly subjective word—that writers define it pretty much as they please

2 An Epithet the Russians use it to stigmatize the policies of the Western states, the anti-Communist powers use it to blacken Soviet policies, and the "uncommitted world' uses it to condemn the policies of both the Communist and non-Communist worlds As Raymond L Buell remarked many years ago, "every unjustifiable demand made by one government upon another—every aggressive war—is called imperialistic Imperialism is a word which indeed covers many sins "[4]

3 *Common Assertions* What commonly passes for imperialism seems to warrant these assertions (i) it may have powerful non-economic motivations—it may, as a matter of fact, be without expectation of economic gain, (ii) it may pertain to a very limited operation—a "vast empire" need not be contemplated all, (iii) it need not involve a difference of race — there may very well be imperialism within a single race, and (iv) it may be planned or unplanned

4 *No Regard for People* Imperialism may be with or without any regard for the welfare of the inhabitants of the area in question It may be developmental or exploitative It may promote the capacity for self-government or ruthlessly suppress all impulses in that direction Finally, it may be economically profitable for the imperialist country, or it may be decidedly unprofitable

5 *Projection of Alien Power* Charles Hodges called imperialism "a projection externally, directly or indirectly, of the alien political, economic, or cultural power of one nation into the internal life of another people It involves the imposition of control — open or covert, direct or indirect — of one people by another "[5]

Economic Imperialism

In protest against the fuzzy use of the word Imperialism, Professor William L Langer said "Some may argue that imperialism is more than a movement toward territorial expansion and that financial imperialism in particular lays the iron hand of control on many countries supposedly independent But if you try to divorce imperialism from territorial control you get nowhere If imperialism is to mean any vague interference of traders and bankers in the affairs of other countries, you may as well extend it to cover

---

4 Raymond L Buell *International Relations rev ed* (New York Holt, 1929) p 503

5 Charles Hodges, *The Background of International Relations* (New York John Wiley & Sons 1932), pp 421, 422

any form of influence. You will have to admit cultural imperialism, religious imperialism, and what not. Personally, I prefer to stick by a measurable, manageable concept"[6]

Thus imperialism pertains to a relationship in which one area and its people are subordinate to another area and its government. Thus imperialism always involves subordination. It is a power relationship without moral implications of any kind.

Object of Imperialism

"The Object of imperialism," Professor Hodges said, "is to affect the destinies of the backward people in the interest of the more advanced from the standpoint of world power." Here the term "backward" should be interpreted in a power sense. History furnishes many examples of peoples being held in bondage by stronger but culturally less advanced peoples.

COLONIALISM

What is Colonialism?

1. **Hobson.** In his classic study of *Imperialism . A Study* (1902) J.A. Hobson's said "Colonialism, in its best sense, is a natural overflow of nationality; its test is the power of colonists to transplant the civilization they represent to the new natural and social environment in which they find themselves."[7]

2. **Winslow.** Colonialism is the "occupation of virgin territory in which conflict was incidental, or even unnecessary, and subordinate to the desire of Europeans to find a new place to live."[8]

Imperialism v/s Colonialism

According to Winslow Imperialism, quite properly suggests something more organized, more military, more self-consciously aggressive, bent on objectives above and beyond those of colonialism.

Hobson said that "the 'colonial' party in Germany and France is identical in general aim and method with the 'imperialist' party in England." At the Bandung Conference of 1955 President Sukarno of Indonesia said : "I beg of you not to think of colonialism only in the classic form which we ... knew. Colonialism has also its modern dress in the form of economic control, intellectual control, and actual physical control by a small but alien community within the nation." The Bandung Conference did not agree on the

---

6. William L. Langer, "A Critique of Imperialism," *Foreign Affairs, XIV* (October, 1935), 107.
7. J. A. Hobson, *Imperialism : A Study*, 3rd ed. (London, 1938), p. 7.
8. Winslow, p. 4.

meaning of colonialism This historic gathering of the representatives of twenty nine countries of Asia and Africa solemnly resolved that "colonialism in all its manifestations is an evil which should speedily be brought to an end' But whereas the spokesmen of Pakistan, the Philippines, Thailand, Turkey, Iraq and Cylon voiced apprehensions concerning Soviet colonialism, the representatives of the "uncommitted world," led by Nehru of India, denied that there was such a thing as Soviet colonialism While the delegates could all agree that colonialism was "an evil," they could not agree on what it was or where it existed

Thus, imperialism and colonialism cannot be precisely defined They cannot always be distinguished from each other Both terms refer to a superior-inferior relationship Hundreds of millions of people, particularly in Asia and Africa, have resolved to abandon their historic role as inferiors and to assert their equality with the people of the former colonial powers In current practice the two terms are used almost interchangeably

IMPERIALISM AND NATIONALISM

"Modern imperialism," wrote one authority, "was born with the break up of mediaeval universalism [when] the rise of national self-consciousness brought a desire for expression in a wider sphere" The new states sought to extend their boundaries and create empires by the conquest of lands usually inhabited by peoples considered heathen, and "they more or less consciously tried to foist upon the natives their own social and cultural systems by 'Hellenizing the barbarians' in a particular and national rather than in a universal way" In doing so, "rivalries waxed strong, each modern nation wanted to extend its newly established nationality overseas in a New Spain, a New Holland a New France, or a New England by sending out colonists or by assimilating in some degree the native races" Out of these endeavours emerged the Spanish Empire, "the first realization of modern imperialism' It was Spain's monopolistic exploitation of her colonies that "forced competitors along the path of imperialism" Later, after the imperialist recession "protectionism as a combination of national sentiment, lust for power and individual greed again became rampant," and the "new imperialism" was launched [9]

Nationalism in the form of desire to exalt a state and to add to its prestige drives men into carrying their flag, their culture, their language, and their institutions into every power-weak area on earth It compels governments to justify, defend, and champion the economic ventures of their nationals in foreign lands, especially weak ones

---

9 Bonn pp 606 607, 609

To quote Townsend, "Just as romantic nationalism clothed the crass materialism of expansion with a beautiful idealism, the concept of 'the white mans burden,' with humanitarianism and uplift of the 'little brown brothers,' so materialism with its 'economic necessity' advanced the national arguments of 'surplus population,' outlets for capital and bursting overproduction."[10] During the last years of the nineteenth century Professor Hans Kohn spoke of imperialism and nationalism as "interlocked": He said Imperialism is for the most part a later phase in the process begun by nationalism. Nationalism strives to unite the members of one nation, politically and territorially, in a State organization. When that is accomplished the struggle for the possession of the earth proceeds further.... imperialism then inflames the nationalism of the oppressed peoples or fractions. Thus imperialism and nationalism are interlocked.[11]

Buell had in mind the same relationship when he said that "paradoxical as it may seem, pure nationalism has forced governments into the path of imperialism."[12]

On the other hand Winslow held that the two are based on fundamentally different concepts. He said, "Nationalism has within it the same feeling as has democracy, that of mutuality, but imperialism is an exclusive concept. Wherever the spirit of exclusiveness creeps into a nation, as it well may, it is a sign that the nation is losing the attributes of nationalism, international, and democracy and is setting forth on the ancient business of telling "foreigners" what to do and what not to do, which is the path of empire. ... nation-building and empire-building by no means involve the same set of attitudes; in fact, they involve attitudes which are essentially opposed to each other, and which find their opposite expressions in popular rather than scholarly reactions.[13] Winslow's thesis is more interesting than convincing.

THE MOTIVES OF IMPERIALISM

1. *Economic Gain.* Economic gains include conquest for the sake of loot, the quest for competition-free markets and sources of raw materials, the search for virgin fields of investment for the capitalists of imperial powers, and the urge to secure certain strategic raw materials. While the nineteenth-century imperialist's declaration that "trade follows the flag" is not verified by statistics, nevertheless he believed it.

2. *National Prestige.* Generations of Englishmen gloried in the boast that "the sun never sets on the British Empire." Alone, but many other people

10. Townsend, p. 37.
11. Nationalism and Imperialism in the Hither East (New York : harcourt, Brace, 1932), p. 49.
12. Buell, p. 315.
13. Winslow, p. 7.

are intoxicated by dimensions Benito Mussolini loved to move his hand over the map of those expanses of African desert and hill land that he had brought under the Italian flag Speaking of imperialism Hans Kohn made the following observation on its noneconomic impetus

"Besides the economic urge, psychological motives played a great role in imperialism—the lust for adventure and for power, the added prestige and glory which seemed to accrue from a vast colonial empire not only to the governing classes but even to the masses of the colonizing nations, the new sentiment of pride and superiority which animated even the lowest members of the white races in their dealings with the "backward' races "[14]

3 *The White Man s Burden* In the past, many members of "advanced Western societies believed that their state had a moral obligation to carry the blessings of their own religion and civilization to "backward" peoples The white man had a duty to uplift his less fortunate brothers, usually in the yellow man's Asia or in the black man's Africa Countless missionaries, soldiers, and administrators braved the perils of the strange and unknown President William McKinley announced that in answer to his prayer for guidance God told him "to take them all [the Philippine Islands], and to educate the Filipinos, and uplift and civilize and Christianize them, and by God's grace do the very best we could by them, as our fellowmen for whom Christ also died " The conquest of Latin America is a classic example of imperialism in behalf of a religious mission

Many a consecrated soul has unwittingly served the cause of militarism or economic exploitation From 1870 to 1914 millions of people have been sincerely committed to the idealism of the White Man's Burden

In 1893 Joseph Chamberlain, declared that "it is our duty to take our share in the work of civilization in Africa " Albert J Beveridge thus interpreted America's responsibility "God has made us adepts in government that we may administer government among savage and servile people "

Raymond L Buell declared years ago that "it would be a gross perversion of fact to say that European and American imperialism was originally inspired by a desire to better the lives of the people whom it forcibly subjugated", but, he added, "there have been a number of instances where governments have established political control for humanitarian purposes "

4 *National Defense* Imperialism may serve national defense by providing areas and bases for the defense of the state or its lines of communication, by providing much needed markets and sources of essential

---

14 *Force or Reason Issues of the Twentieth Century* (Cambridge Mass Harvard University Press 1937) p 80

raw materials, and by providing populations from which troops and labourers may be drawn. States have often sought to protect themselves by gaining control of outlying or border areas, either by completely subordinating the areas or by winning influence over nominally independent states, called buffer states. Thus through most of the nineteenth century England relied upon the buffer states of Afghanistan, Persia, and Tibet for the defense of India against Russia.

5. *Surplus Population.* Statesmen have at times supported imperialism because they saw in colonies an outlet for a population growing with embarrassing rapidity. Between 1925 and 1933, while Japan was trying to justify her designs on China with the population-pressure argument, less than four per cent of her population increase of that period migrated to her own colonies. During the last decade of her colonial empire, 1904-13, Germany sent only one out of 24,000 of her annual population increment to her colonies—in absolute numbers, about thirty persons a year.

6. *The Marxist-Leninist View.* The Communists apply the term imperialism to a phase in the expansion of capitalism, but, not to their own expansionism. While Leninist imperialism, which is a Communist theory explains the inherent and progressive inequity of capitalism, Soviet imperialism, is a term applied by anti-Communists to the pattern of subversion and subjugation carried on by the Soviet Union.

Lenin held that capitalism led inevitably to imperialism. "If it were necessary to give the briefest possible definition of imperialism," he wrote, "we should have to say that imperialism is the monopoly stage of capitalism."[15]

HISTORY OF MODERN IMPERIALISM

Old Imperialism

Modern imperialism may be divided into the old imperialism, for which we might set the somewhat arbitrary dates of 1492 to 1763, and the new imperialism, extending from about 1870 to the present or at least until World War II. Between these two periods there was a full century of comparative quiet in the rivalry of states in the building of colonial empires. The dates of the old imperialism and the new are literally the periods of imperialist expansion.

The impetus of the old imperialism was the emerging nationalism. Its philosophy was mercantilism. Its tools were the innovations of more advanced technological societies that gave Europeans almost complete assurance of victory over non-European peoples. Gunpowder was the most persuasive among the tools. But printing and banking also conferred immense

---

15. Varga and Mendelsohn, p. 192.

advantages, as did advances in the building of ships, roads, and fortifications and in the science of navigation The principal gainer was Britain But Spain, Portugal, and the Netherlands also won great colonial empires

The New Imperialism

Beginning about 1870, the impetus of the new imperialism was well summarized by Professor Parker T Moon as follows

> an anti-imperialist, free-trade Europe was converted to imperialism, rather suddenly in the seventies and eighties, when England began to feel the competition of other industrial rivals, when manufacturing nations began to raise protective tariff walls around their own markets and to compete bitterly for foreign markets, when steamships and railways provided facilities for world commerce and conquest, when greedy factories and hungry factory towns called out for raw materials and foodstuffs, when surplus capital, rapidly accumulating, sought investments in backward countries, when the doctrine of economic nationalism triumphed over the old individualistic liberalism [16]

Imperialist control was established in many ways It was asserted through complete military conquest It took the form of negotiations between representatives of two supposedly equal but actually unequal "states" In addition to the techniques of military conquest and fraud, imperialists devised others the mere threat of force, demoralization through economic penetration, and the undermining of the established regime by friends of an outside state Plebiscites were held on quite a number of occasions to determine to what state a particular area should be joined, to permit a small population to choose its allegiance as a colony or possession Recent history offers a political oddity in the form of "independent" states agreeing by plebiscite to subordinate themselves to another state, the Soviet Union

CRITICAL EVALUATION

Evil Effects of Imperialism

History is a evilness to the staggering abuse of the native inhabitants of the "backward' areas under to imperialistic control In the mid-1920's half the world's land area and one-third of the human race had a colonial status European states possessed colonies with twice their own total population and twenty times their own area In the 1920's the area of the colonial empires of the world was roughly eight times the size of the United States Their population was more than five times that of the United States

---

16 Moon pp 56-57

Forced Labour

Profit from colonies usually depended upon the use of native labour. Imperialist powers used ways of forcing natives to till the soil, dig for gold, gather rubber, hunt for ivory, or collect coconuts. Through slavery, forced labour, heavy taxation, and the confiscation of land they succeeded in getting the work done. Often the natives were forced to give a share of their crops or their time to the government. Often troops directed forced labour. Sometimes a hut tax or poll tax was imposed, payable only in labour or in certain products. Sometimes native chieftains were rewarded for mobilizing their tribesmen for labour. Labourers were imported from strange and distant lands. Punishment to for refusing to work included : lashing, mutilation, death, separation from wife and family, confiscation of land, or exclusion from hunting grounds.

Imperialist powers also exploited their colonials to obtain revenue. About half the revenue from French West Africa came from taxes on hard liquor. In the Far East the British, profited from the encouragement of gambling and opium smoking. In American colonies and protectorates, United States occupation forces engaged in blood-letting on a scale to shock the American public. There was sharp discrimination against the natives and in favour of white men. The brutalities of imperialism do not suggest that it may have anything to do with "culture" or with Christianity. The yellow men of Japan and China have proved amazingly resourceful in the techniques of human to true and abuse.

Development of Colonies

However, even before World War I colonial regimes contributed to the welfare of their dependent populations. Most of them set up public schools and encouraged missionaries. Some of them used natives in local government. Nevertheless the expenditures on education in colonial areas were pitifully small. About eighty per cent of the educational work was done by missionaries. Imperialist powers learned that education did not make for docility; rather, the reverse was true.

In the postwar era the colonial powers granted independence to most of their colonial possessions. Though most of the peoples formerly under colonial rule discovered that the tasks of economic viability, social cohesion, and political development are more difficult than the winning of political independence.

Advantages of Imperialism

The United States never sought to buy an income from colonies. Instead, it bought Canal defense and continental security. Other colonial powers also bought defense in the form of strategic areas, sometimes merely land to appease an aggressive nationalism. The incentive to French imperialism after 1880 was

the "persistent urge to enhance national prestige and to vindicate French cultural superiority"

As Cady has pointed out, "French politicians after World War II were thus denied the easy rationalization of the eventual surrender of their colonial empire in Indo-China in terms of the vindication of French ideals," whereas "Americans could see in the emancipation of the Philippines a vindication of the principle of 'government by the consent of the governed,' and the British accepted the independence of India as fulfilment of the concept of a commonwealth of equal partners "[17] British grace in granting independence to India was largely *ex post facto*

Hobson's *Imperialism*

The ablest pioneer in the study of the economics of imperialism was John A Hobson (1858-1940) Early in the twentieth century has concluded that colonies gave no assurance of the control of raw materials They formed no trading areas of substantial value They gave negligible relief to population pressures They made little or no contribution to the economic welfare of the colonizing state Thus imperialism was "a depraved choice of national life, imposed by self-seeking interests which appeal to the lusts of quantitative acquisitiveness and of forceful domination surviving in a nation from early centuries of animal struggle for existence" "The laws which, operative throughout nature, doom the parasite to atrophy, decay, and final extinction," declared Hobson, "are not evaded by rendering some real but quite unequal and inadequate services to 'the host' " Hobson's theory had "a more direct and apparent influence on the writing of history, at least in the English language, than that of Marx and the Marxists [18]

In 1936 Grover Clark published the results of a comprehensive appraisal of economies imperialism just before Musolini, Hitler, and World War II rang the curtain down on the old imperialist order In the preface to *The balance Sheets of Imperialism*, Clark asserted that three main claims had been made about the value of colonies (i) they provided important outlets for population, (ii) they made possible valuable trade opportunities that would not otherwise be available, and (iii) they added to the security of the colonizing state by assuring it of raw materials in both war and peace He added that "the actual record demonstrates conclusively that each of these three claims is essentially fallacious"[19]

Hans Kohn denies the charge that "Western imperialism introduced poverty, wars, racial discrimination, and economic exploitation into Asia and

---

17 Cady, p 295

18 Hobson, pp 367, 368

19 Clark, pp 9-17

Africa." Those conditions have existed from time immemorial. "As far as historical memory goes" Asian peoples have enslaved other Asian people, and African tries have exterminated or enslaved other African tribes. Western imperialism, though guilty of "many injustices and cruelties ... has awakened and vitalized lethargic civilizations." The standards of justice now used in condemning imperialism are products of the West — "developed by the Western world and only by the Western world."

Colonialism, according to Kohn, has nothing to do with race or race superiority, "one of the most bewildering myths of the present time." Rule by one people of another is an old story in Europe. Resentment of it has been manifested as strongly there as in Asia and expressed in "the very same words which are now used in Africa and Asia by the anti-colonialist leaders."[20]

THE PRINCIPLE OF TRUSTEESHIP

In 1837 a British Parliamentary committee asserted what the principle of trusteeship in substance. By mid-century "the eventual self-determination of colonies was viewed with equanimity by nearly all British statesmen."[22] The United States occupied Cuba and the Philippines at the close of the Spanish-American War with the promise to grant them independence in due course. Nevertheless, "the principle that dependencies are a trust of civilization had influenced theory more than practice when the [First] World War broke out ... but the principle ... was beginning to have effects in practice."[22]

The imperialist effort to put the principle of trusteeship into effect related to a number of aspects of colonial life : land ownership; native labour, imported labour, foreign capital, education, health and preparation for self-government. Some efforts were made to break up the large plantations on which native worked and to encourage private ownership of small land tracts. Higher wages, better working conditions, and controls on the involuntary movement of workers were practiced in some colonies. Some states entered into agreements to modify the severity of the conditions under which labourers were obtained in large numbers from China or elsewhere for service in colonial areas. Governments in appropriated money for education. Various missionary bodies spent far more than governments. Medicine, too, was long the province of missionaries. The work of William Gorgas in Panama and that of Walter Reed in Cuba are the best-known instances of the rendering of medical service by an imperialist power. The training of local personnel for

---

20. Hans Kohn, "*Reflections on Colonialism*", pp. 7, 10-12.
21. Quincy Wright, "Mandates," *Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1937). X, 88.
22. Wright, *Mandates Under the League of Nations*, pp. 10, 11.

handling the lower administrative posts was a conspicuous feature of British Colonial government The coaching of Cuba, the Philippines, and Puerto Rico for self-government was a declared policy of the United States There was clearly a growing sense of responsibility All states, even the most advanced, have been doing no more than groping their way forward at home during the past few decades in respect to certain aspects of government service and policy This is true in labour relations, control of foreign capital, vocational training, and education, sanitation and health, and, in a formal sense at least, in preparation for citizenship

Imperialism often encountered powerful resistance in the homelands of the great imperialist powers Anti-imperialist associations of various kinds influenced government policy in Great Britain, Germany, and the United States Newspapers raised a cry against colonialism or against some of its abuses The British press should be given credit for the distinct improvement in the treatment of colonial populations which began about 1910 But long before national reform made any significant modification in colonial practices the idea of international responsibility had taken root The international conferences of Berlin in 1885 and Brussels in 1890 gave concrete form to the growing conviction that the control of backward areas was a trust for the benefit of the natives and for the good of the world

QUESTIONS FOR EXERCISE

1 Define Imperialism and discuss its advantages and disadvantages

2 Define Colonialism Assess its advantages and disadvantages

13

Alliances, Allegiance, Isolationism and Nationalistic Universalism

ALLIANCES

Definition

Alliances are instruments of foreign policy to maintain balance of power within a multi-state system and promote national interest of the country. The states resort to alliances as a matter of expediency. A state run alliance is strong enough to hold its own without any assistance, such a state is reluctant to assume commitments resulting from an alliance. If the advantages accruing from an alliance are less than the commitments involved, the state may avoid alliance. Thus the alliances are formed by a country only in national interest. In the language of the statesmen and diplomats, the term alliance means a provision of mutual military assistance between two or more sovereign states. Alliances are concluded to supplement the national armed forces, since the states concluding the alliances formally promise to help each other in fighting a common enemy. Sometimes the alliance may merely mean grant of permission to deploy forces on its territory or a right to move forces across the territory. Again, the alliances may be concluded for the promotion of co-operation in other fields, though generally the military considerations underlie this co-operation. If the military resigns alliances have no chance of being successful.

The alliances were non-aggressive before World War I. The alliances usually contained a clause which obliged the signatory states not to indulge in aggression. If a state party to alliance provoked a war, the other ally was relieved of the obligation to help the former.

Development of Alliances

1. Ancient Period. History of ancient India, ancient China and ancient Greece shows that alliances were concluded by different states to promote their national interest. The alliances were not popular during the Roman rule when the Roman Empire spread over vast territories and was dominated by a single power.

2. Mediaeval Period. *The alliances continued to be a feature of* inter-state relations The allied states often concluded alliances to check some state which aimed at establishing its hegemony Towards the closing years of the nineteenth century and the beginning of the present century the world was divided into two groups of alliances known as Triple Alliance and Triple Entente The First World War was largely due to the formation of *these alliances*

3. Inter War Period. Vigorously pursuing the policy of forming alliances, France concluded a number of alliances with different countries to secure itself against possible German threat Despite these alliances, she failed to check Nazi Germany

4. Post-World War Period. The policy of formation of alliances was again revived in the post World War II period The lead in the formation of alliances was provided by U S A She evolved a global system of alliances in which were involved more than forty non-communist countries of Europe, Asia, and Latin America Some of the prominent alliances concluded after Second World War included NATO, Warsaw Pact, SEATO, CENTO etc The Soviet Union also formed counter alliances with the Communist countries Thus the world came to be divided into two opposing military blocs Later on Communist China concluded alliances with a number of Communist countries in the post World War II period These to be nursed upon hostility towards each other, were purely defensive in nature

Asset as well as Liability. Alliance is both an asset and a liability In *so far as it has the prospect of military assistance in case of need and acts as* a deterrent against the enemy country it is an asset It adds to the prestige of the smaller countries by bringing them closer to the powerful allies On the other hand the alliance is a liability as it is a drain on a country's strength, even though the national interests of the state may demand abstention from involvement in the conflict

Kinds of Alliances

Morgenthau has mentioned the following kinds of alliances

1. Serving Identical Interests. The alliances may be concluded by the states to serve identical interests e g, the Anglo-American alliance whose objective is to preserve the balance of power in Europe The alliance between *USA and Pakistan is an example of alliance* designed to promote complementary interest conducive to the American Policy of containment It increased the political, military and economical potentialities of Pakistan in relation to India

2. Ideological Ideological alliances lay down certain general moral principles The signatories to these alliances pledge to observe these principles and work for the realisation of the objectives of the alliance The Treaty of Holy

Alliance of 1815 and Atlantic Charter of 1941 were alliances of the category. The Treaty of Arab League concluded in 1945 was also an ideological alliance in so far as it pledged the Arab States to show solidarity against Israel. Most of the alliances formed by the Anglo-American group were ideological alliances formed to fight Communist threats and subversions.

3. Mutual v/s One-Sided. Alliances are mutual if the services rendered by a party to alliance are commensurate with the benefits received by it. Alliances concluded by states with equal power and serving identical interests are mutual alliances. The alliance is branded as one-sided if the major benefits of an alliance accrue to only one party while the other has to bear the main burden.

4. General v/s Limited. General alliances try to protect the total interests of the contracting parties both during the war as well as peace. The wartime alliances are general alliances. On the other hand, the alliances concluded during the peace time are generally limited since they are concerned only with a fraction of the total interests of the signatory states.

5. Temporary v/s Permanent. A temporary alliance is formed during the war-time to win the war and secure the interests for which the war was waged through peace settlement. The alliances concluded during peace times for the promotion of limited interests are of more durable nature.

6. Operative v/s Inoperative. Operative alliance coordinates the general policies and concrete measures of the signatories. Its members agree on the general objectives as well as policies and measures. On the other hand certain alliances are concluded by states because the members do not agree on the concrete policies and measures.

(i) *Power Struggle.* Alliances have been responsible for the power struggle among the nations. These may be the symptoms rather than the cause of struggle among powers by dividing the world into two antagonistic blocs. They contribute to the intensification of the conflict.

(ii) *World Peace and Balance of Power.* The alliances play a positive role in the preservation of world peace by contributing to the process of balance of power. They muster adequate counter power and act as a deterrent against aggression.

(iii) *Growth of Unity.* The alliances help in the growth of confederation or some sort of a federal unity among the sovereign states. For example, the unification of both Germany and Switzerland, was the result of the war time alliances. Solidarity and affinity created among the members of the alliance proves so strong that they forge themselves into new nations. However, the alliance concluded during war breaks up as soon as the common danger disappears.

(iv) *Conflict* In course of time conflicts develop among the allies to undermine their solidarity For example, the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation, Which was organised by the USA in the post-World War II period is faced with strains on account of differences amongst the members regarding the possession of strategic nuclear forces This is mainly because the global interests of USA are difficult to harmonise with the purely local or regional interests and perspectives of the partners

ALLEGIANCE

Allegiance has been adopted by certain countries of Third World Under allegiance these countries become allies of one of the two superpowers to win certain advantages Their ties with the superpowers enhance their sense of national security It helps them to obtain foreign aid needed for internal development It promises aid of arms to deal with enemies at home and abroad Generally the countries following policy of allegiance extend full support to the philosophy and viewpoint of the superpower They extend full allegiance to it unmindful of the fact whether they have entered into an alliance with it or not They also look to the superpower for guidance, support and assistance The superpowers also encourage allegiance They provide huge funds and other facilities to win over the small powers to their side They try to win over the support of political parties, trade unions, pressure groups, business and other outstanding leaders who can influence the national policy If they find the allegiance of the government lagging they try to bring about change in government and bring a group into power which owes allegiance to

1 The policy of allegiance leads to loss of a political freedom However, the states pursue it because of the material and political benefits they hope to get as an ally of a superpower The power owing allegiance to the leading power follows the hints given by the leading power Refusal to do so would lead to denial of certain benefits and cause inconvenience Generally the weaker states give preference to the wishes of the senior partner without bothering about its sovereign rights

Thus the policy of allegiance possesses the following characteristics .

1. Formal Equality. The states involved in this arrangement are of an equal strength

2. Domination of Bigger Power. In spite of formal equality among the states, the bigger power dominates The degree of autonomy left to the weaker states is inconclusive for strong leadership It may be asked to submit to the stronger power in its own interest

3 Security. Allegiance to a Great Power automatically involves recognition of the fact that the small power has the ability to commit its ally, and that the latter cannot accept the losses attendant upon its weaker partner's defeat

ISOLATIONISM

Meaning of Isolationism

Isolationism means low level of involvement in the political, military, diplomatic and commercial transactions with other states. It is based on the assumption that security and independence can be best secured by cutting of most transactions with other states and by maintaining diplomatic and commercial contacts with other states while handling all perceived or potential threats by building deterrents at the home front.

Causes of Isolationism

1. Self-Sufficiency. This policy is possible only in a system with reasonably diffused structure of power. Military, economic or ideological threats do not exist and the other states are regularly shifting allegiances. This policy is generally adopted by states which are self-sufficient in their economic and social needs. The activities of other states do not leave much impact on the internal developments of the isolated state. The states can maintain commercial or diplomatic relations to the extent that they do not lead to unpleasant military consequences or military threats from abroad.

2. Geographical Isolation. Policy of isolation may be adopted due to geographical reasons or seeks to meet the actual or potential threat by withdrawing behind the frontiers and erecting defences. High mountains, wide seas or deserts give protection to the political units as the other states do not possess the necessary means to by pass these. In the nineteenth century Nepal could follow policy of isolationism because of the presence of high mountain barriers and not so easily accessible routes. British military, economic and political influence could not make intrusion into Nepal on account of its natural barriers. The natural barriers are no more able to protect the isolation of Nepal, and the country has been thrown open to the external influences on account of the recent technological and military advancements which have enabled China to build roads in the Himalayan valleys.

3. Deliberate Policy. In the face of a perceived threat a country may deliberately adopt policy of isolationism. Japan adopted this policy after it came in contact with the Europeans. To prevent its conquest by Europeans or to prevent the infiltration of their culture into Japan, the Japanese emperor sealed off the Japanese islands. Japan maintained limited trade relations with some of the Europeans. However, after the middle of nineteenth century, when the Western powers in the Pacific had increased their naval power tremendously Japan could not persist with this policy. It not only abandoned the policy of isolationism but also entered into active commercial and military coalitions with Great Britain, the United States and other European countries. It began to take active part in the conflicts in Far East.

ISOLATIONISM OF U.S A.

From the very beginning, U S A adopted policy of isolationism due of different reasons U S A was a part of the European system in terms of commercial and cultural contacts However, it was not directly involved in the various ideological, national and dynastic issues which separated the various European powers. Therefore the American leaders avoided entangling in alliances with countries of Europe Justifying this policy Adams said "It is obvious that all powers of Europe will be continually maneuvering with us, to work us into their real or imaginary balance of power But I think, it ought to be our role not to meddle, and that of all the powers of Europe, not to desire us, or perhaps even to permit us to interfere if they can help it" Likewise George Washington held that in view of U S A.'s geographical location, the policy of isolationism was best suited to her U S.A was isolationist only in the military and the political sense She maintained commercial and intellectual intercourse with other states

Causes of American Isolationism

1. Peculiar Geographical Location The broad expanse of the Atlantic Ocean which separated United States from Europe served as a great barrier to communication It protected her against any potential naval invasion from the continent

2. Self-Sufficiency. The high degree of self-sufficiency in land, raw materials and natural resources also greatly contributed to the adoption of the policy by U S A The vast tracts of land available with U S A enabled to attain self-sufficiency in agriculture and obtain manufactured goods from other European countries through trade

3. Limited area of Conflict. Most of the conflicts of the period were confined to the continent, the Mediterranean Sea and the Balkans and the Americans did not feel much concerned about them Even the rivalry among the various European powers, viz , Spain, France and England, with regard to the New World were resolved by the end of the Napoleonic wars To quote Norman A Graebner, "the gradual intensification of American security with the Altantic ocean, rather than with a British dominated European balance of power created the foundations of twentieth century American isolationism, which viewed less involvement in European affairs as the essence of sound policy"

Change in Isolationist Policies

With the dawn of the twentieth century America's policy of isolation underwent a marked change By and large it avoided involvement in European affairs, though it adopted expansionist policies in Latin America and Western Pacific without involving much military or financial expenditure On account of serious threat to democracy from Germany, she extended support to European democracies She reverted back to policy of isolationism soon

after the war. The American Senate refused to ratify the Treaty of Versailles since it committed USA to membership of League of Nations and involved the country in undefined and unforeseeable contingencies. This return to isolationism was to the Americans "largely an expression of the nation's democratic idealism. Its purpose was to protect the uniqueness of American society against the corrupting influence of European politics."

U.S. Isolationism in Inter War Period

By and large, U.S.A. continued to follow a policy of isolationism in the inter-war period. Only after the Japanese attacked the Pearl Harbour, she decided to take part in the Second World War. In the post-World War II period, its isolationist policy underwent a great change. Now U.S.A. began to play an active role in the international sphere. One of the strong proponents of isolationist policy in the pre-World War II period Senator Robert A. Taft said in 1950, "I don't know what they mean by isolationism; nobody is an isolationist today." Even President Eisenhower said in 1952 "I have long insisted-and do now insist, that isolationism is dead as a political issue." In view of the growing threat from Communism to the American society, the isolationist policy of USA assumed a new character. Norman A. Graebner has rightly observed, "Anchored to such assumptions of omnipotence, American isolationism in the twentieth century became identified with a primary concern for the domestic economy, an over-estimation of American power and a belief in the nation's moral superiority, all of which encouraged the tendency towards unilateralism in diplomacy. Isolationism, though a logical consequence of geography and the national experience, was in fact the creation of several generations of writers, editors and politicians. It triumphed as a political programme and achieved a predominant place in American thought simply because no other course of national action would promise so much at such negligible cost. World War II and the events that followed destroyed only the illusion of geographical isolation. The traditional belief that the United States would achieve security at the expense of itself than nation with few physical advantages was not destroyed."

NATIONALISTIC UNIVERSALISM

The foreign policy of every country is primarily designed to promote national interests but certain universal principles have given weightage in the formation of the foreign policy. These are : promotion of world peace, maintenance of justice among all the nations, advancement of liberty of the people, development of general human welfare. The policy of Nationalistic Universalism, according to Schwarzenberger, depends on three conditions:

1. The state aiming at universal domination must possess overwhelming superiority especially in the military field.

2. It must have an ideology which gives it the necessary impetus and self-confidence to carry out its world mission.

3 It must have at its disposal the technical means of organisation that are required not only to conquer a world empire but also to hold it together Examples of Nationalistic Universalism are Pax Britannica, Pax Americana, Pax Sovietica

PAX BRITANNICA

The period of Pax Britannica is the period between the Congress of Vienna and the First World War (1815-1915) During this period Britain played a dominant role in European politics to preserve the balance of power system in Europe The supremacy of Britain was threatened during this period only on two occasions first in 1854-56 during the Crimean War when the Russians threatened to dominate the Constantinople, second in 1870-71 during the Franco-Prussian War, which led to displacement of France by Germany as a leading power on the Continent

Causes of Pax Britannica

According to Prof Palmer and Perkins, Pax Britannica was "made possible by a favourable combination of circumstances at home and abroad England's leadership in the Industrial Revolution, in international finance, and in world trade, her navy, which gave her control of the seas and free access to her widespread possessions and to the markets of the world, and the *post- Napoleonic situation in Europe which gave Britain no formidable* challenger to her unique position until the rise of Germany"

Decline of British Power

England's dominant position in the political as well as industrial field began to show a decline towards the close of the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth century With the rise of United States, Japan and Germany started competing for markets and underdeveloped areas of the world She posed a challenge to naval supremacy of Britain In the economic sphere Japan and USA began to compete with Britain All this posed a serious threat to the Pax Britannica Britain ceased to play the role of a balancer She became member of one of the rival alliances

Post-World War I Period

In the post-World War I period, Britain lost her dominant position She could no longer play an effective role on the world stage due to the *rising nationalism* in Near East, Middle East as well as India The Russian Revolution of 1917, gave a further impetus to anti-British movements in different parts of the British Empire For some time Britain succeeded in maintaining a semblance of its authority even though it lost the dominant position of the earlier years

Post-World War II Period

The international balance of power in Far East was greatly disturbed in the Post-World War II period. Due to in view of her weakened position Britain could not play its historical role in the area. Some sort of power vacuum was created in the region. Soon Soviet Union and USA, the two rival giants rushed in to fill this vacuum.

Twentieth Century

There was a sharp decline in the power and influence of Great Britain in the twentieth century. This was partly due to her internal difficulties and partly due to competition with other states possessing larger populations and resources. The rising tide of nationalism in the former colonial possessions of Britain made a large contribution in this regard. Though the British power continued to gradually decline after the First World War it could be clearly seen only after the Second World War. Now conscious of the weak position of Britain even the British statesmen did not boast of Pax Britannica though even now they tried to capitalise as much as possible on Britain's past influence and prestige. Britain made necessary readjustment in her foreign as well as domestic policies.

However, Britain still occupies a prominent position among the world powers. She is an important sea power even though she has lost the command of the seas. In Post World War II period her exports have shown an increase. Britain lost most of the income from overseas investment which were the main source of her economic strength in the nineteenth century. Her basic industries like coal, steel, textile etc. considerably declined. Conscious of the weak position of Britain, Prime Minister Harold Wilson announced in January 1968 the decisions of his government to reduce Britain's military expenditure, and withdrew British forces from East of Suez by 1971. The British Chancellor of Exchequer Roy Jenkins said in a TV address, "We are recognising that we are no longer a superpower."

PAX AMERICANA

Pax Americana denotes the dominant role U.S.A. came to play in the Post World War II period in complete contrast with isolationalist role. After the establishment of the Republic, President Washington asserted that USA could play a great role in the foreign affairs by extending commercial relations with the European countries and having least political connection with them. He advocated the policy of non intervention with other foreign powers. Reiterating this policy in 1823 President Monroe said : "It is only when our rights are invaded or seriously menaced that we rent injuries or make preparations for our defence." This policy of non intervention with regard to Europe continued right up to 1945. Even though Charles A. Beard prefers to describe it as continentalism it was a policy isolationism.

During the two Wars

America adhered to the policy of non-intervention until the Second World War During the two world wars U S A intervened massively in the conflict between the coalitions of European powers

Post-War Period

This deviation went a long way in post-World War II period In the words of Scotsman D W Brogan it created the '*Illusion of American Omnipotence*' Americans believed that their power was universal and decisive and that U S A could resolve any international issue However, U S A expressed faith in principles of nationalistic universalism In 1963 the U S Secretary of State Dean Rusk defined America's goal as to achieve "a free community of nations— independent but interdependent-united North and South, East and West, in one great family of men, outgrowing and transcending the great antagonism that rend our age"

Describing America's goals in world affairs, a State Department publication in 1964 specified national security through strength, progress through partnership supporting the post-war revolution of freedom, promoting the concept of international community under law and peace through perseverance By and large USA has tried to adhere to these principles

Wide Spread Alliances

In the Post-World War II period USA tried to claim dominant position in the world affairs It felt concerned over the Russian attempts to bring the whole of Eastern Europe under its grip By the pronouncement of the 'Truman Doctrine' USA helped Greece and Turkey to check the Communist encroachments To check the growing menace of Communism she launched a comprehensive European Recovery Programme She provided economic and technical assistance to the Afro-Asian nations under the Four Point Programme She sponsored or concluded a number of military alliances to meet the Communist threat in various regions such as the Organisation of the American States (OAS) in the Western Hemisphere, North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO), the South East Asia Treaty Organisation (SEATO), the Central Treaty Organisation (CENTO) and ANZUS, U S A also resisted the Communist encroachments through actual use of military force in Korea, Berlin, Vietnam, etc

Status in Europe

United States tried to increase its influence in Europe It provided emergency aid to a number of countries after the Second World War It undertook European reconstruction through the European Recovery Programme (Marshall Plan) It organised NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organisation) etc Gradually, some of the Western European countries challenged the dominant position of USA in the region The emergence of

the European Economic Community, posed a challenge to the hegemony of United States in Europe. However, U.S.A. continues to play an important role in Europe though it has lost the dominant position.

U.S. Policy in Latin America

U.S.A. did not pursue isolationist policies in Latin America. During the thirties the countries of the hemisphere felt dissatisfied with U.S. policies. Axis powers also contributed to this dissatisfaction. President Roosevelt tried to create harmonious and truly co-operative inter-American relations. She tried to develop close relations with countries of Latin America in the Post-World War II period. In 1947 U.S.A. concluded the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance. By this the member states agreed to treat an attack against any American state as an attack against them. U.S.A. also granted enormous economic assistance to these countries. As the Communist threat to the region increased USA began to interfere in the affairs of the Latin American States. To protect the democratic governments USA intervened in Guatemala, Nicaragua etc. Fiedel Castro of Cuba, refused to call popular election. He nationalised billion dollars worth of property owned by the American firms in the country. Gradually, the relations between Cuba and United States deteriorated and reached a shooting point. This situation was saved due to the decision of Soviet Union to demolish the Soviet bases in Cuba. Thereafter, U.S.A. sought to preserve and extend its hegemony over Latin America through gun-boat diplomacy, military occupation and rigged elections. Reagan further changed American policy towards Latin America. U.S.A. adopted the doctrine of 'low intensity warfare' subordinating military goals *per se* on the principle that sufficient damage and disruption should be inflicted on the opponent to convince him to negotiate. The economic dimensions of this strategy call for large but selective injections of aid to consolidate.

U.S. Policy in Far East

United States also tried to play a dominant role in Far East. During the Second World War USA tried to preserve the integrity of China to checkmate the designs of Japan. U.S.A. failed to check the emergence of the Communist power in China in Post-World War II period. However, USA tried to build up Taiwan as an independent state. She also managed to keep China out of the United Nations for a long time. Ultimately, USA improved relations with China. She provided every possible military assistance to South Korea pushing the forces of North Korea checking the growth of Communist influence.

U.S. Policy in South East Asia

In South East Asia USA sought to check the growth of Communist influence. She offered every possibly assistance to France for the control of Indo-China. To check Communist growth she encouraged formation of

SEATO (South East Asia Treaty Organisation) on the pattern of NATO She extended liberal aid to Laos to make it an anti-Communist bastion When the possibility of conflict with Soviet Union on Laos issue increased U S A succeeded in getting Laos' neutrality recognised at the Geneva Conference of 1961 Vietnam was the deepest involvement of USA in this region, costing it heavily in terms of men and money

U.S. Policy in Middle East

In the Middle East, USA evinced keen interest in the Post-World War II period To ensure stability in this part of the country, she provided large financial assistance to the countries of this region Baghdad Pact was made to check the Communist threat During the Suez Crisis of 1956 United States sought for withdrawal of Anglo-French forces from Egypt Despite its intimate relations with Israel, she maintained intimate relations with the countries of Middle East In 1973 the position of USA in Middle East changed due to Arab-Israel War The Arab countries applied oil weapon to compel United States adopt more constructive attitude in the Arab-Israel conflict However, U S A played a leading role in bringing about a negotiated settlement between Egypt and Israel culminating in Camp David Agreement

In the beginning of 1979 the downfall of the Shah and towards the end of the year the Soviet intervention in Afghanistan gave a serious setback to Pax Americana in Middle East Pax Americana suffered a setback with the Marxist revolution in Afghanistan and the Islamic upheaval in Iran

Factors of Decline of Pax Americana

1. Decline in the Productive Superiority. Though in the 1950's United States produced half the world's steel but by the end of 1970's it produced only one-fifth Japan surpassed USA in the field of automobile production and electronics Western Europe made great stride in the production of aircrafts

2. Advantage to other Nations. The decline in productivity led to advantage to other nations such as Japan and European countries

3. Emigration The desire for high standards led to high level of emigration to regions of recent settlement Examples are migration of capital from north-east to Sun belt in USA and out of the country.

4. Low Budget. The under-investment in education, research and development and over-investment in military sector also undermined the position of United States The government of USA had low budget in all sectors except military

5. Free Trade Policy. At a time when protectionism was spreading elsewhere free trade policy undermined the position of United States She persisted with this policy due to big banks and multinational corporations, who played increasing role in USA

New Hegemony of USA

In Gulf War of 1991, the victory of America over Iraq has been interpreted by certain scholars as restoration of American hegemony over international system. They have contended that U.S.A. went beyond the UN mandate on the Gulf issue. The other great powers like Soviet Union and China could not exercise any restraint on her. Other maintain that it would be erroneous to interpret the recent American victory in the Gulf war as restoration of her hegemony. At the end of Second World War there was Pax Americana. U.S.A. was able to lay down rules of the post, war international economic and trading systems. But since 1970's the strains on the international economic system, the technological challenge from western Europe and Japan and military power of Soviet Union posed a serious challenge to American hegemony. The position of America has considerably improved in the international arena as a result of detente between Soviet Union and Washington and retreat by Soviet leaders from the international scene. US alone can claim to be the most balanced power though she is not in a position to determine the structure of new world order unilaterally. It has to secure widespread international support.

PAX SOVIETICA

Pax Sovietica is the policy of extending the Soviet influence and culture in other parts of the world. This expansionist impulse has been ever present in Russia since the Czarist rule. Russia expanded its territory towards Finland and the Baltic, towards Poland, towards the Caucasus and the Caspian Sea and Central Asia; towards Siberia and Pacific. She nourished ambitions to expand in Balkans, the Turkish Straits, Afghanistan, Tibet and China. These ambitions were thwarted by other powers.

As a result of Revolution of 1917 Soviet Russia could not play any effective role in the international sphere due to preoccupation with the internal affairs and the existence of powerful countries like Britain, France, Germany etc. In the nineteenth century Britain, Imperial Japan in early twentieth century and Axis Powers in 1930's and early forties were opponents of Russia.

Post-World War II Period

In the Post World War II period Soviet Union tried to extend her influence in Poland, Yugoslavia, Albania, East Germany, Hungary, Romania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Outer Mongolia, Manchuria, North Korea, etc. by promoting Communist governments in these countries. She herself assumed the leadership of the Communist bloc. She concluded a number of treaties and agreements with countries of Eastern Europe. She took a lead in the establishment of a Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (COMECON) with Poland, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Hungary, Romania and Albania. In 1950 she concluded a Treaty of Friendship alliance and Mutual Assistance with

Communist Government of China In 1955 she led in the conclusion of the Warsaw Pact with Albania, Bulgaria Hungary, East Germany, Poland Romania and Czechoslovakia Soviet Marshal I S Koniev was appointed Commander of the Unified Command Soviet Union emerged as the undisputed leader of the Communist countries However, certain cracks began to appear in the Communist bloc Tito led Yugoslavia out of the Soviet satellite system China developed differences and began to compete with Soviet Union for leadership of the Communist Movement The break of Albania with USSR gave a further set back to Soviet leadership

Influence in the Third World

Russia provided greater aid and stepped up its cultural activities She consistently championed and actively supported the anti-colonial cause at the UN such as Indonesia's struggle against the Dutch, Egypt's revolt against British hegemony, and Algeria's revolution against France This improved its image with the Afro-Asian countries and contributed to its influence in the Third World However, a number of countries of Asia and Africa bluntly told the Soviet leaders that the rejection of the Western capitalism should not be interpreted as acceptance of Soviet mastery Thus though Soviet Union provided enormous aid to the Third World countries, they have shown a tendency to assert themselves

Status in Middle East

Soviet Union tried to increase its influence in the Middle East in refusing to withdraw the Soviet troops from Iran after the war, though finally it was obliged to do so Thereafter she tried to increase its influence in the region by extending support to the revolutionary movements of the countries in Middle East It supported the expulsion of British from Iraq and Egypt and ouster of France from Levant and North Africa It also made available military and economic assistance to the countries of region It offered to underwrite the cost of the proposed dam at Aswan and its offer to send 'volunteers' to assist Nasser during the British-French and Israeli attack, further contributed to the improvement of Soviet image in the region She also succeeded in winning over Algeria by supporting revolt against the French However, this Soviet influence in the region could not last long Her failure to render active military assistance to the Arab countries during the Arab Israel War of 1967 gave a serious setback to Soviet influence in the region which continued to decline Towards the close of the 1970's she was once again able to asset her dominant position due to Marxist revolution in Afghanistan in April 1978, gave a serious setback to American influence in the region, though it contributed to the increase in the influence of Soviet Union

However, attempts by countries of Third World to act independent of the two super powers, the policy of liberalisation adopted by countries of Eastern Europe and the decision of the Soviet leaders to make a retreat from the international scene, led to further decline of Soviet hegemony. The winding off of the Warsaw Pact proved the loss of Soviet Dominance in Eastern Europe. The failure of Soviet Union to play an active role during the Gulf War of 1991, has been interpreted as loss of Soviet influence in the middle east. Recent disintegration of U.S.S.R. into independent states has given a death blow to Russian influence and finished the world's division into two blocs. U.S.A. is now the biggest power in the world.

QUESTIONS FOR EXERCISE

1. Define Alliances. Trace their development. Explain their kinds and impact.
2. Write Short note on Allegiance.
3. *Explain Isolationism giving example of U.S.A.*
4. Explain Nationalistic Universalism projected by Britain, U.S.A. and Soviet Union.
5. Write short-note on Pax Sovietica.

14

War and National Policy

The problem of war Edward M Earle rightly declared is the greatest unresolved riddle in politics The coming of total war and the nuclear and space age has given it a new and greater urgency

Is War Inevitable

That war and not peace is the normal condition of civilized human society seems to substantiated by the elaborate documentation of the types and frequency of wars throughout history in Quincy Wright s classic two volume work *A Study of War* In 1960 a Norwegian statistician with the use of a computer announced that in 5 560 years of recorded human history there have been 14 531 wars or 2 6135 a year and that of 185 generations of man s recorded experience only ten have known unsullied peace [2] In the twentieth century the incidence of wars has not abated and potentially their scale has increased tremendously In spite of the fearful lessons of two global wars and the frightful prospects of a nuclear holocaust limited wars of varying types have been as frequent since 1945 *Time s* essay On War as a Permanent Condition It listed 40 wars since 1945 It pointed out that 22 of the 40 crises involved Communists eight were anti colonial struggles and three were outright land grabs In only three cases have nuclear armed nations indulged in high handed power plays in the past 20 years Britain and France in Suez and Russia in Hungary in 1956 and the United States in Cuba in 1961

War is not Normal

Professor Arnold Toynbee insists that war is not man s normal condition He calls attention to the fact that whereas before the reign of the Emperor Augustus the Romans were seldom at peace for 265 years from 31 B C to 235 A D peace was generally preserved with insignificant and *temporary interruptions* that prior to the invasion by Nazi Germany in

1 Edward M Earle 'The Influence of Air Po ver upon History" *Yale Review* XXXV (Summer 1946) 592

2 "On War as a Permanent Condition *T me Essay Time* September 24 1965

1940, Norway, the land of Vikings, "had been at peace for 126 years without a break", and that whereas "during the millennium ending in 221 B.C., the Chinese world was as full of wars as the contemporary Mediterranean world,... since the political unification of China in 221 B.C., China has normally been at peace down to this day, with some exceptional bouts of internal disorder of the kind that punctuated the shorter lived Roman peace."[3]

A Recurring Phenomenon

Nevertheless, war does seem to have been a recurring phenomenon in almost all parts of the world at almost all periods of history. "It is doubtless safe to say," declared Raymond Fosdick, "that half the tragedies in the long story of the human race have been due to the inability of men to find any method except organized slaughter as a means of solving their rivalries and antagonisms.[4]" "Recourse to war appears to follow no particular pattern in terms of race, form of government, social order, or stage of development after the appearance of warfare and property interests some five thousand years ago."[5]

What is War?

Today the term "war" is used in many different ways: cold war, hot war, limited war, total war, conventional war, unconventional war, civil war, guerrilla war, preventive war, political warfare, propaganda war, psychological war-fare, and so on. The Communists often use such terms as "imperialist wars" and "wars of national liberation." Wars may be limited in various ways— in geographical scope, in weaponry in duration, in size of contending forces, in degree of actual commitment, in frequency, in intensity. Total war may refer to total commitment. In the nuclear age it usually refers to a war fought by many combatants, including the superpowers, with all the arsenals of atomic and other un-conventional weapons. In contemporary parlance total war refers to World War III.

DEFINITION OF WAR

1. New English Dictionary. War is a "hostile contention by means of armed forces, carried on between nations, states, or rulers, or between parties in the same nation or state; the employment of armed forces against a foreign power, or against an opposing party in the state."

---

3. Arnold J. Toynbee, "War Is Not the Normal Condition of Man," *New York Times Magazine*, November 7, 1965, pp. 122, 124.
4. Raymond Fosdick, "We Need New Words and New Faiths," *New York Times Magazine*, December 19, 1948.
5. Charles Hodges, "Why War?" in F.J. Brown, Charles Hodges, and J.S. Roucek, *Contemporary World Politics* (New York : John Wiley & Sons, 1940), p. 25.

2. Hoffman Nickerson In the Encyclopedia Britannica, "War is the use of organized force between two human groups pursuing contradictory policies, each group seeking to impose its policy upon the other" This is a broader and somewhat more general definition than the first

3. Karl Von Clausewitr. "War, is only a part of political intercourse, therefore by no means an independent thing in itself war is nothing but a continuation of political intercourse with an admixture of other means"[6] This statement is useful in calling attention to the broader setting in which the nature of war must be examined

4. Quincy Wright. In the broadest sense war may be defined, "a *violent contact* of *distinct* but *similar* entities," and in a narrower and more exact sense as "the *legal condition* which equally permits two or more *hostile groups to carry on a conflict by armed force*"[7] *In the material sense war, "is a* phenomenon distinguished not by *qualitative* but by *quantitative* differences" In the legal sense, as defined in recent international law, war is "a legal condition or state" and there is a sharp line between war and peace.[8]

CHARACTERISTICS OF WAR

According to Professor Wright, "History suggests that war has at times been considered (1) a customary reaction to circumstances jeopardizing group solidarity and security, (2) a legitimate instrument of state policy, (3) an indispensable means for maintaining justice, (4) a legitimate procedure for quarrels between sovereigns, (5) an inevitable condition of the istence of sovereign states, and (6) an illegitimate form of state behaviour While most of these conceptions have been held by some members of most human groups, the first is characteristic of primitive societies, the second of ancient societies, the third of medieval societies, the fourth in the first stage of modern society, the fifth in international law prior to World War I, and the sixth in the new international law elaborated in general conventions since that war."[9]

War in the Modern Period

Since about 1500, the general tendency of warfare in the modern period has been to become more terrible in almost every respect Factors aggravating this tendency are . the development of new and vastly more powerful weapons, the evolution of total war, many other concomitants of the age of industrialism, militarization, and ideological struggle on an unprecedented scale In the words of Quincy Wright, "War has during the last four centuries

6 *On War*, Translated by O J Mathijs Jolles (New York Modern Library, 1943), Book VIII, Chapter 6, p 596

7 Wright, *A Study of War I*, 8, II, 685 Italics in original

8 Wright, *History of Concept of War*, pp 116-18

9 *Ibid*, p 120

tended to involve a large proportion of the belligerent states' population and resources and, while less frequent, to be more intense, more extended, and more costly."[10]

According to Quincy Wright's analysis, there is a development from "the first stage of modern society" when war was considered to be "a legitimate procedure for settling quarrels between sovereigns," to the later stages, when it changed from "an inevitable condition of the coexistence of sovereign states" to "an illegitimate form of state behaviour."[11] However, the last half-century has witnessed a growing movement for the outlawing of war and for building the institutions of peace on a sounder basis.

On the other hand, the science of warfare has constantly improved. Vannevar Bush, who headed the Office of Scientific Research and Development in the United States during World War II, declared that the technological innovations of World War I "made mechanized warfare possible," that the scientific developments of World War II "rendered conventional military practice obsolete," and that "over the horizon now loom radiological and biological warfare, new kinds of ships and planes, an utterly new concept of what might be the result if great nations again fly at each other's throats. It is this which makes the thinking hard."[12]

THE CAUSES OF WAR

Summarising the manifold causes of war, Quincy Wright said, "Writers have declared the cause of World War I to have been the Russian or the German mobilization; the Austrian ultimatum; the Sarajevo assassination; the aims and ambitions of the Kaiser; Poincare, Izvolsky, Berchtold, or someone else; the desire of France to recover Alsace-Lorraine or of Austria to dominate the Balkans; the European system of alliances; the activities of the munition-makers, the international bankers, or the diplomats; the lack of an adequate European political order; armament rivalries; colonial rivalries; commercial policies; the sentiment of nationality; the concept of sovereignty; the struggle for existence; the tendency of nations to expand; the unequal distribution of population, of resources, or of planes of living; the law of diminishing returns; the value of war as an instrument of national solidarity or as an instrument of national policy; ethnocentrism or group egotism; the failure of the human spirit; and many others."[13]

In a series of lectures published under the title *Causes of War and Conditions of Peace*, Professor Wright related them to the following aspects of the world situation : "(1) a state of opinion violently hostile to the

---

10. Wright, *A Study of War, I*, 248.
11. Wright, *History of the Concept of War*, p. 120.
12. *Modern Arms and Free Men* (New York : Simon and Schuster, 1949), pp 3, 16
13. Wright, *A Study of War, II*, 727-28.

existing state of affairs, (2) inadequacy of international organization to deal with conflicts, (3) inadequate system of law, (4) unstable equilibrium of material forces " He also emphasized the fact that economic and political factors entered powerfully into every one of these considerations [14]

In *A Study of War*, Wright pointed out "War, politico-technological, juro-ideological, socio-religious, and psycho-economic causes "[15] *In a book* entitled *The Causes of War and the New Revolution* Tell A Turner listed forty-one causes of war, under these headings . economic, dynastic, religious, and sentimental [16] In a textbook in international relations published in the early 1930's, Professor Charles Hodges drew up an elaborate chart listing twenty-one causes of war under four "primary causes" social, political strategic, and economic (i) *The social causes* religious, racial, cultural chauvinistic, and fear (ii) *The political causes* monarchic, domestic, nationalistic, imperialistic, diplomatic, and juridic (iii) *The strategic causes* territory, disarmament, armament, world position, and vital interests (iv) *Economic causes* population, commercial policy, foreign investment, indemnities, and neutral rights [17] It would seem that there is no end to the listing of causes of war

Many commentators have, however, stressed one factor, or at most a very few factors, as the major cause of war Thus Communist dialecticians distinguish between imperialist wars, revolutionary wars, and wars of national liberation The seeds of war, they allege, are inherent in capitalism and in imperialism

Wickham Steed expressed the belief that fear is the chief cause of war "The feeling of insecurity," he wrote many years ago, "and the fears which it engenders, are undoubtedly the strongest potential causes of war in the world today " A large number of "sovereign" states and lesser political units, with no adequate regulatory devices or agencies for peaceful readjustment on a supernational level is the major cause of modern war Arnold Brecht declared "There is a cause of wars between sovereign states that stands above all others—the fact that there are sovereign *states, and a very great many of them* "[18]

---

14 Quincy Wright, *Causes of War and Conditions of Peace* (New York Logmans, Green & Co , 1935)

15 Wright, *A Study of War II*, 739

16 T A Turner, *The Causes of War and the New Revolution*, Boston Marshall Jones Co , 1927

17 Charles Hodges, *The Background of International Relations* (New York ' John Wiley & Sons, 1932), p 555

18 ' Sovereignty," in Hans Speier and Alfread Kahler, eds , *War in Our Times* (New York W W Norton & Company, 1939) p 58

Clearly, then, the causes of war are many and varied, and they may be analyzed in many different ways, all of which are likely to be at the same time useful and artificial. There is no simple or single explanation for such a complex phenomenon as war. "A war, in reality," as Quincy Wright has pointed out, "results from a total situation involving ultimately almost everything that has happened to the human race up to the time the war begins."[19]

FUNCTIONS OF WAR

A. Major functions

1. *Social Function.* War has performed functions that have been socially desirable. It has made contributions quite beyond the capabilities of any other means.

2. *Righting of Wrongs.* Professor Eagleton noted that "for centuries, war has been regarded as a means of remedying unjust situations, of settling disputes, of enforcing rights."[20]

3. *Instrument Against Aggression.* Professor Shotwell added that "war has been used as an instrument against criminal aggression as much as it has been the instrument of aggression itself. It has played a beneficent role in history as well as a criminal one."[21]

4. *Escape from Oppression.* A student of history can point to countless instances in which war was the means by which peoples escaped from oppression which to them had become intolerable. The American Revolution ended a regime which the colonists had come to regard as denying the natural rights of man. The French Revolution overturned a corrupt and autocratic monarchy. The Latin American Wars of Independence removed the heavy hand of Spain and gave to Latin Americans the opportunity to build their own lives and fortunes. The American Civil War ended once and for all the question of national unity and it brought the abolition of Negro slavery. The wars in the Balkans brought release from Turkish misrule. The Spanish-American War gave Cubans relief from the tyrannical rule of Spain.

5. *Overthrowing Capitalism.* Stalin declared that "capitalism can only be overthrown by means of revolution which will take the form of protracted and violent struggle to the death." Mao Tse-tung wrote : "... the central task and the highest form of revolution is to seize political power by force, to solve problems by war.... Political power emerges only from

---

19. Wright, *A Study of War, I,* 17.

20. Eagleton, p. 5.

21. James T. Shotwell, *War as an Instrument of National Policy* (New York : Harcourt, Brace, 1929), p. 15.

among the guns Yes, we do uphold the revolutionary 'omnipotence of war' This is not bad It is good, it is Marxist The whole world must be recreated with guns "[22]

6 *Bettering the lot of people* Millions of poverty-stricken, ignorant, and isolated people, living under almost intolerable conditions, welcome war in the hope of bettering their lot in life Many living in the Soviet-dominated states of Eastern Europe, as well as refugees from this area, feel that war offers the only hope of regaining their lands and their freedom

The Minor Functions of War

1 *The Reconstruction and Modernization of the Political and Social Order* In his significant book *War as an Instrument of National Policy*, Professor James T Shotwell, asserted "War has been the instrument by which most of the great facts of political national history have been established and maintained It has played a dominant role in nearly all political crises, it has been used to achieve liberty, to secure democracy and to attempt to make it secure against the menace of its use by other hands "[23] Professor Quincy Wright said "War has been the method actually used for achieving the major political changes of the modern world, the building of nation-states, the expansion of modern civilization throughout the world, and the changing of the dominant interests of that civilization "[24]

2 *The Exaltation of Moral and Spiritual Qualities* In the past many have thought that war contributed to the attainment of higher moral spiritual qualities Some believed that the sacrifices of war were a form of atonement for past sins Others thought that suffering called attention to unrealized blessings Still others maintained that bloodshed and deprivation showed the superficiality of the materialistic ambitions that had led people to neglect spiritual values

In the United States, on the eve of the Civil War, an articulate segment of public opinion believed that war had or might have moral and spiritual functions These sentiments have been expressed in other democratic states also Spokesmen of totalitarian states extolled the moral and spiritual virtues of war during the 1930's and early 1940's

3 *Weeding out Inferior peoples* Some writers, particularly Germans, have insisted that war is a necessary process for weeding out weak and inferior peoples

---

22 Quoted by Shen-Yu Dai in Mao Tse-tung *Selected Writings of Mao Tse tung* (Harbin Manchuria, 1948)

23 *Op cit* p 15

24 Wright, *A Study of War I* 250

In his famous pamphlet *Germany and the Next War*, published in 1914, General Friedrich von Bernhardi said, "War is a biological necessity of the first importance, a regulative element in the life of mankind which cannot be dispensed with, since without it an unhealthy development will follow, which excludes every advancement of the race, and therefore all real civilization ... Without war, inferior or decaying races would easily choke the growth of healthy budding elements, and a universal decadence would follow."[25]

4. *Productive and Creative Revitalisation.* Early in World War II, it was "an official credo of several powerful nations ... that war, elsewhere than on the battlefield, makes such peremptory demands upon a nation that it revitalizes that productive and creative processes of the whole of society."[26]

5. *Other Minor Functions.* Other writers have pointed out following minor functions of war:

(i) foreign wars are sometimes essential to unity and peace at home;

(ii) war may provide a less painful outlet for surplus population than starvation and disease;

(iii) war has stimulated inventions;

(iv) war has produced a veritable revolution in industrial and agricultural production.

Although prepared before the outbreak of World War II, Dulles' "False or Inadequate Solutions" may still be regarded as a thoughtful and useful compilation of a number of suggested ways by which war might be prevented.

Dulles' "False or Inadequate Solutions"[27]

1. *Education as to the horrors or war.* The weakness of this approach to peace is that it relies primarily emotion. It is "ineffective as a mass influence because ... war as it becomes totalitarian ceases to be a selfish pursuit." Devotion to the country's cause is not left to chance; "when critical times arise, control of mass emotions tends to pass into official hands."

2. *Education to the fact that "War Does Not Pay."* The inadequacy of this approach is explained by the fact that "war is represented as a sacrificial act." We cannot gain our goal by persuading people that self-interest is the primary consideration, in terms of which all else must be judged"; "the

---

25. *Op. cit.*, pp. 11, 18, 20.

26. Jesse D. Clarkson and Thomas C. Cochran, *War as a Social Institution : The Historian's Perspective* (New York : Columbia University Press, 1941), p. 180.

27. *War, Peace and Change* (New York : Harper, 1939), pp. 72-99. Dulles also presented some interesting proposals for the prevention of war (pp. 100 ff.).

remedy is not to be found in deprecating unselfishness and extolling material or personal selfishness as the desirable standard of human conduct"

3 *Isolation and Economic Internationalism* The purpose here is evidently to show the fallacy of isolation and of economic internationalism as two opposite approaches of peace Those who favour isolation argue that contacts produce conflicts, there to avoid conflicts, avoid contacts The weakness of the argument is twofold

(i) It is difficult or impossible to isolate nations against ideas, and the precipitant of modern war is primarily ideology, and economic contacts are seldom its cause"

(ii) "The refusal of certain nations to facilitate economic intercourse with others may take a form which will itself be a contributing cause of war because it gives rise to a sense of repression and confinement"

Economic internationalism is an unsatisfactory approach to peace for several reasons (i) It may be artificially stimulated [as by credit] to a point where a reaction becomes inevitable which causes isolation more complete or more expressive than would otherwise have been the case (ii) A debtor state may be driven to economic regimentation, autarchy, and an exaggerated nationalism (iii) The creditor state may become irritated and resort to 'aspersions" on the debtor state (iv)ICC ILL will may arise against an importing state's domestic interests may be adversely affected by "obnoxious imports" (v) Since too much foreign trade may make a country dependent upon others and thus subject to embarrassment if the trade should be cut off, "large measure of economic independence is desirable"

4 *Renunciation of War* The Kellogg-Briand Pact, or the Pact of Paris, of 1928 war the outstanding formal effort to outlaw war by international agreement It was adhered to by more than sixty nations It condemned "recourse to war for the solution of international controversies" and renounced war "as an instrument of national policy ' However, the pact was powerless to prevent even small conflicts like the Italo-Ethiopian war It was ignored by the Nazi and Fascist leaders whose actions precipitated World War II According to Dulles the Pact of Paris sought to "realize a desirable result without taking any of the steps essential to achieve it" "So long as force is the only mechanism for assuring international changes," concluded Dulles, "then a purported renunciation of force is a nullity Far from being sacred, it would be inequitous, even if it were practicable, thus to put shackles on the dynamic peoples and condemn them for ever to acceptance of conditions which might become intolerable"

5 *The League of Nations* The Covenant of the League was "well conceived and susceptible of practical, constructive evolution" Article 19 authorized the Assembly to "advise the reconsideration by Members of the League of treaties which have become inapplicable and the consideration of

international conditions whose continuous might endanger the peace of the world." This Approach to peace had following limitations :

(i) The dominant members of the League, however, mistakenly conceived peace as the preservation of the *status quo* and the League as an instrument for that purpose.

(ii) As the Treaty of Versailles had been drawn up in an atmosphere of emotion and so embodied many injustices, only a willingness to promote peaceful change could prevent an eventual breakdown of peace itself.

(iii) The League Covenant became, for "all practical purposes, an alliance to perpetuate rigidly the post war status. 'Sanctity of treaties' became the League slogan and those seeking change were branded as potential 'aggressors.' "

(iv) The League was further in incapacitated for its proper role by the refusal of the United States to join, by the withdrawal of certain dissatisfied powers, and by Britain's disengagement of her foreign policy from the framework of the League.

(v) The failure of the League was thus due not so much to its structural defects as to the unwillingness of its members to utillize the instrumentalities which the Covenant had created and put into their hands.

6. *Non-recognition of the Fruits of Aggression.* This approach is "essentially another variant of the doctrine that peace means a rigid and unchanging world structure." It holds an intermediate position between the Pact of Paris and the League of Nations.

This approach has following weaknesses:

(i) Non-recognition is not calculated to deter a major power. It will influence only weak powers, especially those under the influence of some major power.

(ii) It is not a policy which can be consistently and continuously applied, for it is based upon the absurd assumption that changes brought about by force are not changes at all.

(iii) We can condemn the use of violence in domestic society, for provision is made there for peaceful evolution and change, but we cannot "indiscriminately carry forward moral judgments of aggression into a society within which neither political nor ethical solutions are operative."

(iv) There are too few nations which have so controlled their own conduct that their officially expressed moral indignation rings true to others.

(v) Non-recognition when applied under circumstances of this kind, "serves as an irritant rather than a pacificator."

7. *Armament.* This approach to peace is supported by two theories:

(i) This was officially presented by a number of states at the Hague Peace Conference, was held that the more frightful war became "the less

likelihood there was of its becoming a reality " Two interrelated considerations make this theory unworkable and dangerous

(a) The prosecution of war has shifted "from an operation motivated by selfishness to an operation motivated by unselfishness' The effect of this change is, of course, to arouse a sacrificial spirit among people which in part disregards or even embraces the frightfulness of modern war

(b) ' The creation of vast armament in itself calls for a condition midway between war and peace Mass emotion on a substantial scale is a prerequisite " Moreover, "a sense of peril from abroad must be engendered." Once these conditions have been brought about, "we have gone a long way on the path towards war" and "it is dangerous to rely upon reasoning as to consequence to restrain against the small additional transition necessary to the actual attainment of war "

(c) A notable consideration is the effect on the internal standard of living and on domestic tranquillity and huge expenditures for armaments

(ii) The second theory of peace through armament was supported by France during the years following World War I This called for heavy armaments for the *status quo* powers and disarmament for the states which would soon be seeking to revise the *status quo* in their own favour The peace treaties saw to it that Germany, Austria, Hungary, Bulgaria, and Turkey were disarmed and forbidden to rearm Two errors underlie this approach

(a) It assumes that the classification of powers will be permanent.

(b) The theory presumes the absence of a national dynamics, a condition that will never exist The success of this approach is contingent upon the continuous maintenance of superior armaments by the *status quo* countries However, imagined security invariably leads to carelessness and to opposition to the cost of "needless" military establishments A false sense of security prompts these states to undo the very conditions on which they are dependent for the continuance of peace

8 *Disarmament* If armaments are conducive to war, disarmament is the road to peace This is not issue It is more realistic to argue that "so long as the force system prevails, then armament has a utility" and that "so long as it has utility, so long will armament survive and the greater the utility, the greater will be the armament (subject to limitations of finance) " While disarmament cannot be the means of obtaining peace, vast armaments do produce economic waste and emotional aberrations which become precipitating causes of war

9 *Sanctions* In his discussion of the weaknesses of sanctions, Dulles apparently had in mind both police force action and the operation of general collective security the organizations If "public force serves as deterrent to

individual acts of violence [within states] ... why should we not in the international field adopt a similar procedure?" The idea is right, but it requires some important qualifications.

(i) A police force can deal effectively only with "marginal and usually abnormal elements" which do not accept the social forms agreeable to most of the people.

(ii) Sanctions cannot themselves be "a primary method of avoiding violence. This task is one to be achieved by the creation of a balance form of world society.

(iii) Sanction may operate as a challenge to states. "Thus the dynamic nations, feeling themselves to be the likely subject of sanctions by the *status quo* nations, are spurred on to build up their armament and attain economic self-sufficiency." When states react in this manner, the result is the accentuation of nationalism and the encouragement of the very policies which the sanction concept was supposed to prevent.

(iv) Another weakness of this approach is that it encourages the tendency towards undeclared wars. This comes about because the invocation of sanctions is contingent upon the announcement by some high authority of the existence of a state of war. In an effort to avoid commitment, the authority can pretend to see no war when none has been declared. The failure to declare war can thus disrupt the whole system of sanctions.

Mr. Dulles concluded his analysis of "false and inadequate solutions" with these words: "Most peace efforts have had only ephemeral results because they are limited to striking directly at an undesired manifestation. There is a failure to deal with causes which, if unaltered, inevitably produce that which we would avoid."

WORLD GOVERNMENT

Most of the proposed alternatives to war call for the strengthening and more effective use of procedures which call for some kind of world government, on a regional or global scale. These proposals start with the thesis, that there is no hope of averting war as long as the nation-state system is the prevailing pattern of international society, therefore this increasingly anachronistic system must be replaced by effective supernational institutions to which the nation-states would surrender at least the most vital of their present powers.

In 1965 an eloquent statement of the case for "a world state embracing the whole of society," by the leading historian of civilizations, Professor Arnold Toynbee said, "Since civilization has become global now and since the whole surface of our planet has become a single arena for war making purposes, the world state that we have to build must be on a literally worldwide scale. ... The obstacle is no organizational or technological; it

is psychological'[28]

But as long as the nations of the world so jealously guard their 'sovereign rights" there is little prospect that they can be persuaded or forced to surrender their rights to supernational agencies All proposals for world government would take us from where we are to where they think we should be No political leader would advocate the abandonment of national sovereignty unless he was absolutely convinced that some larger association would actually work As Professor Shotwell said "Humanity cannot afford to trust its wistful hopes to anything, however promising, that may betray it in the hour of crises"[29]

Criticism

An incisive analysis of "the illusion of world government" has been made by Reinhold Niebuhr He said, "The fallacy of world government, can be stated in two simple propositions The first is that governments are not created by fiat (though sometimes they can be imposed by tyranny) The second is that governments have only limited efficacy in integrating a community [30] He declared that the idea of world government assumes that constitutions can insure the mutual trust upon which community rests," and he observed that "no group of individuals has ever created either government or community out of whole cloth" Even if a world government were established, Niebuhr contended, it could not create a genuine community "for the simple reason that the authority of government is not primarily the authority of law nor the authority of force but the authority of the community itself Laws are obeyed because the community accepts them as corresponding, on the whole, to its conception of justice" To put it another way, "the police power of a government cannot be a pure political artifact It is an arm of the community's body If the body is in pieces, the arm cannot integrate it" Moreover, if a world government were established, it would be more likely to be established by force than by force than by consent

PACEM IN TERRIS

Pope John XXIII issued a circular letter, *Pacem in Terris* from the Vatican on April 10, 1963[31] Addressed to "all men of goodwill," the Pope's encyclical might be regarded, in Vice President Hubert Humphrey's words, as "a public philosophy for the nuclear era" and as an important tract for the times It said, "Love, not fear, must dominate

---

28 Toynbee *War Is Not the Normal Condition of Man* p 127

29 Shotwell p 4

30 "The Illusion of World Government" *Foreign Affairs*, XXVII (April, 1949) pp 88

relationships between individuals and between nations," and that the road to peace lies not "in equity of arms, but in mutual trust alone". It also referred quite specifically to some of the difficult problems of international relations.

One section commented on "The Evolution of Economically Underdeveloped Countries" : "It is vitally important ... that the wealthier states, in providing various forms of assistance to the poorer, should respect the moral values and ethnic characteristics peculiar to each, and also that they should avoid any intention of political domination." Another section emphasized the "Insufficiency of Modern States to Ensure the Universal Common Good": "It can be said ... that at this historical moment the present system of organization and the way its principle of authority operates on a world basis no longer corresponds to the objective requirement of the universal common good." The Pope expressed confidence that "Men are becoming more and more convinced that disputes that arise between states should not be resolved by recourse to arms, but rather by negotiation," and that "all human beings ... are becoming more consciously aware that they are living members of a world community." The entire document was thus a mosaic of moral preachment.

It attracted worldwide attention, and has been referred to perhaps as often as any single document of the 1960's.

This initiative was dramatically highlighted by the visit of John XXIII's successor, Pope Paul VI, to New York on October 4, 1965 for the purpose of addressing the General Assembly of the United Nations. The Pope reminded members that the UN was "the last hope of concord and peace". He urged all nations to seek peace, was an unprecedented event of historic significance.

WAR AS AN INSTRUMENT OF NATIONAL POLICY

If states cannot now safely abandon war as an instrument of national policy, they can be brought to use it more sparingly and only in morally defensible ways. The approaches which may help to remove the scourge of war are progress in disarmament, the development of international law, constructive work in international organizations, the improvement and utilization of the techniques of peaceful settlement and collective security, education for international understanding. There may be other assurances of security which will permit the total relinquishment of war as an instrument of national policy.

Realistic approach to peace will dismiss various idealistic and religious approaches which call for a higher degree of perfectibility than can reasonably by expected of man and his social institutions. The ideals of pacifism

31. *New York Times*, June 11, 1963.

and passive resistance are confined to a small minority of high souled men and women they do not provide

Recognizing the essential futility of pacifism and piety in building effective safeguards against war, must admit that the job calls for morality and idealism, and the realization that certain social functions have been performed by war because men and governments have devised no peaceful means for their performance

War today has potentialities for destruction beyond the range of human comprehension The coming of the nuclear and the space age has ushered in "the age of overkill" President Kennedy predicted that "A full scale nuclear exchange, lasting less than 60 minutes, could wipe out more than 300 million Americans, Europeans, and Russians, as well as untold numbers elsewhere" Dr Albert Einstein, one of the pioneers of the nuclear age, once remarked "I do not know the weapons with which World War III will be fought, but I can assure you that World War IV will be fought with sticks and stones" For the first time in history man has at his disposal weapons powerful enough to annihilate countless millions of people and destroy civilization For this reason, as President Eisenhower, "has been an anachronism Whatever the case in the past, war in the future can serve no useful purpose" Hence it is important to reduce international tensions, to curtail the atomic arsenals of atomic powers, to prevent nuclear proliferation, and to deal with fundamental problems of human misery and unrest as well as with crises as they arise

"No problem is more important , "writes Professor Stanley Hoffmann, "than that of knowing to what extent the invention of nuclear weapons opened a totally hew phase of history—of knowing whether the 'state of war' was drastically transformed or whether, on the contrary, the traditional competition persists, although at a higher level of risk and with new rules"[32]

Peoples and statesmen everywhere should do everything in their power to find alternatives to the war system This task is the central problem of international relations

QUESTIONS FOR EXERCISE

1. Define War ? Can it be abolished ? Suggest remedies
2. What are the functions of War Elaborate Dulles' false or adequate solutions

---

32 *The State of War Essays on the Theory and Practice of International Politics* (New York Frederick A Praeger, 1965) p viii

15

International Relations Before and After World War I

Renaissance and Reformation Movements in Europe

The sixteenth and the seventeenth centuries witnessed the Renaissance and Reformation Movements in Europe ruled by monarchs. The political thinkers and moralists resented the absolute authority of these monarchs. The people in general did not wish to remain as merely "Ryots", suppressing their human rights and fundamental freedoms. Thus the concepts of empires and the supreme authority of the monarchs had begun to fade away fast. The cruelties, atrocities and high-handedness of Bourban monarchs in France compelled the French people to revolt against their rulers. That revolt took the form of the French Revolution which affected the entire territory of Europe. Numerous revolutionary wars were launched on the soil of Europe. Chaos, conflict and turmoil were the order of the day. The Rulers could not suppress popular uprising. Several old dynasties and empires came to their end. Napoleon was defeated and exiled to St. Helena. Peace settlement was by the Congress of Vienna in 1885.

The Vienna Congress 1815

Consisting of the statesmen of England, Russia, Austria and Prussia the Vienna Congress assembled at Vienna in 1815. Its aim was to chalk out a plan for political regeneration of Europe after the French Revolution was suppressed and Napoleon sent to exile. The architects of the peace of Vienna were Alexander I, Castlereagh, Talleyrand and Hardenberg. Their wisdom becomes apparent from their acceptance of Talleyrand, the representative of the defeated State that had destroyed the previous equilibrium in Europe of footing of equality. In creating a new balance of power system, they could work in an expending economic framework.

The Peace Scheme of 1815 aimed at keeping France in an inferior position. It aimed to prevent its ever becoming a threat to peace in Europe. Finally it sought to establish "system of real and permanent Balance of Power

in Europe" To achieve the aim the ruling dynasties were restored in France, Spain and Holland Germany was organised in a confederation under Austria Rules were left supreme in several states Norway was *amalgamated with Sweden Major parts of Poland was ceded, Russia Many* parts of Italy were given to Austria Prussia acquired many districts lying on the banks of river Rhine which brought her close to France Thus the Vienna scheme made the *position of France an inferior one It were only* the victors who were rewarded by the Vienna Congress However, the settlement brought about by the Vienna Congress could not last long Within a short span of time, it became instable

Period of "Classic" Diplomacy and Balance of Power

The period of classic diplomacy began from 1814 and ended with the year 1914 This was the period from the Treaty of Vienna to the beginning of the World War I It was a period of one hundred years During this period the concept of Balance of Power played a great role in determining the international relations among states This period is commonly called "Pax Britannica', which means peace enforced and maintained by the power and diplomacy of British Government The main objective of the *British Balance of Power was two fold— (i) to prevent the rise of any* power on the European continent and (ii) to keep Europe being divided into two or more blocks The pre eminence of British diplomacy depended *upon the disunity of Europe*

Functions Fulfilled by Balance of Power

The functions fulfilled by a balance of power system may be derived from the success and failures of the European balance of power system operating between 1815 and 1914 The gradual growth of nationalism on the soil of Europe and rise of new nations such as Germany and Italy upset that balance of power The European powers increasingly applied the principle of compensation to non-European territories to maintain their relative position in the pre-1914 system of balance of power They followed the precedents set by the partition of Poland and by Napoleon III who had collected Savoy and Nice as *pourboires* They were his price for tolerating the unification and strengthening of Italy This policy found better expression in the division of Africa *and the race of the Power for leases* in China. In the pre-1914 period even the United States pursued an undisguised balance of power policy in the Far-East It consistently sided with the weaker in the *struggle between Russia and Japan*

Growth of Technology and Industrialisation

The growth of technology and industrialisation affected the balance of power system maintained by the British This impact of technology on international politics was so great that new states emerged with new spirit on

the European soil. The new source of power was not the ownership of land but money capital. Nations undergoing the bourgeois revolution stood together for democratisation. Some societies, on the other hand, did not realise the full force of modernisation in their cultural and social life. These developed authoritarian or dictatorial tendencies. Italy and Germany were engaged in getting back what they had lost previously. They considered being deprived of colonies and rightful political prestige. Hence they were bent upon to regain their lost position. This factor, along with the determination of England to enforce its view of the European balance of power, inevitable led to war. Industry became the key factor in determining the political might of the great power. Industrial developments in different countries created rivalries among them. They became very keen for ascendancy. All these factors immensely changed the balance of military power in Europe.

Emergence of New States

During the century preceding the World War the history of international politics is that of emergence of new nations and the efforts of older powers to meet the challenges posed by them.

Unification of Italy and Germany

During a period of one hundred years preceding the First World War the most significant development was the unification of Italy and unification of Germany. It disturbed the European political system in two respects:

1. The smaller autonomous units were forced to remain under the influence of some imperial power. In this respect Austria and Hungary exerted much influence. The emergence of Italy and Germany united and independent nations, however, weakened the position of Austria in course of time.

2. The newly emerged nations such as Germany were dynamic. Other nations did not care to better their positions as for instance Austro-Hungarian empire. Big power attempted to derive advantage from such situation. Austria and Hungary reacted to the challenges posed by new nations, by themselves in relation of subservience to the New Germany. Britain did not lag behind to face this problem. It resorted to her old diplomacy of "Divide and Rule." It failed in its attempt due to numerous political and technological factors which were at work against such a policy.

Political Events Before World War I

Following were the important political events that were responsible for the outbreak of the World War I:

1. The Holy Alliance.
2. Unification of Italy and Germany.
3. The Three Emperors League.
4. The Re-Insurance Treaty.

5 The Dual Alliance
6 The Triple Alliance
7 The Franco-Russian Alliance
8 *The Anglo-French Alliance*
9 The Anglo-Russian Alliance

1. The Holy Alliance The Emperors of Russia and Austria and the King of Prussia formed this alliance on the 26th of September 1815 Its sole object was to apply the principle of Christian morality applied in the *administration of the home affairs to the conduct of their international relations* The most important contribution which this alliance made, was its declaration that the Law of Nations will be the basis for all international relations The alliance tried to establish a legal claim to certain dependencies which asserted their independent For example, the Latin American States had proclaimed themselves independence of the mother country Spain The Holy Alliance intervened and restored these possessions to the Spanish Sovereign On the 2nd December, 1823 President Monroe of the United States made a declaration forbidding the European Power from interfering in the affairs of the American continent This declaration became famous as the Monroe Doctrine The Holy Alliance lost much of its political importance with this declaration

2 Unification of Italy and Germany. After the conclusion of the Vienna Congress in 1815 movement for unification, independence and establishment of democratic governments were started in Europe with full vigour with the result that Belgium, Spain and Portugal became independent Poland revolted against Russia though failed in her attempt By the occupation of Rome the *unification of Italy was completed in 1870 By virtue of the Treaty of Frankfurt* concluded after the Franco-Prussia war the unification of Germany was com pleted Germany and Italy determined to challenge the *status quo* Hence both of them were added to the group of Big Four *It dominated the politics of* Europe which developed imperialistic tendencies It challenged England's supremacy On the other hand, France became actively interested to undo the Frankfurt Treaty Conflict arose suddenly between Austria and Russia over *Balkan issues These factors were collectively responsible for the outbreak* of World War I

3 The Three-Emperors League In 1873 this League was formed at the initiative of the German Chancellor Bismarck comprising three emperors of Germany, Austro Hungry and Russia *It aimed to challenge the* British formidable might on the one hand and to teach a lesson to France on the other, which had incurred enmity against Germany The three rulers agreed to determine a common course of action by mutual consultation in case of any foreign aggression against any of them They agreed to co-operate with one another to preserve peace After five years of the formation of this league

Russia and Austria came into conflict against each other over the Near East question. Bismarck favoured Austria. Russia felt offended. Treaty of Berlin was concluded and the Three-Emperors League came to its end in 1877.

4. The Re-insurance Treaty (1887). When Russia and Austria conflicted over the Balkan issue Germany offended Russia by taking sides with Austria. It adversely affected the relations between Russia and Germany. Germany became keen to restore her normal relations with Austria. It felt that Austria might join hands with France in near future. It entered into Reinsurance Treaty with Austria in 1887 which brought them together again. By this treaty both power promised to observe neutrality in case of war with the third power and to make efforts to localize the conflict. Both powers agreed to respect the territorial integrity of their respective empire. If any change was to be made in respect of Turkey, it was to be finalised by the agreement of the three powers.

5. The Dual Alliance. The Austro-German Alliance was commonly known as the Dual Alliance. It was concluded between Austria and Germany on October 7, 1879. Under it Germany promised to defend Austria against Russia. In 1882 Italy was pursuaded to join this alliance.

6. The Triple Alliance. Germany was not satisfied with the Dual Alliance being limited to only two powers—Germany and Austria. Hence she pursuaded Italy to join the Dual Alliance. On May 20, 1882 Italy joined the Dual Alliance. Thus the original Dual Alliance became popularly known as the Triple Alliance. To quote Professor Fay, "The Triple Alliance in its wording and its origin was essentially defensive in character and designed primarily to preserve peace of Europe, its peaceful and defensive intent was especially marked in the case of Germany." When Italy joined the Triple Alliance, the Italian political leaders were asking Bismarck to improve Italy's relation with France and England. Inclined towards Britain and France, Italy entered into a treaty with Great Britain for maintaining *status quo* in the mediterranean. It also signed a No-War Pact with France. Germany was offended when Italy attacked Turkey in 1902. On May 3rd, 1915, Germany had to sever her relations with Triple Alliance. This gave a death blow to the Triple Alliance.

7. The Franco-Russian Alliance (1863). After Italy severed her relation with the Triple Alliance, Prince Bismarck sought to raise the prestige of his country in the international field. Germany's hatred against France, and Russian sympathy towards France, led to Franco-Russian Alliance in 1893. Under it in the event of an attack by Germany or Italy, France was offered support of Russia.

The Franco-Russian alliance tended to strengthen the scope of European peace. It served as healthy counter price to the Triple Alliance.

8. The Anglo-French Alliance (1904) Being one of the oldest nations of Europe France always tried to establish supremacy in Europe Through her *system of Balance of power England was always keen to exert her influence* on European nations Both these countries were at daggers drawn This struggle for supremacy caused deep rivalries between the two While England desired to counterbalance her position being friendly with Germany, France was in search for taking revenge upon Germany Germany's hostile attitude in the Boer War and unfriendly manners towards England, forced England to give up her policy of "Splendid isolation" *vis-a-vis* Europe She began to seek friends in Europe Thus France was a traditional enemy of Germany Germany's expansionist policy posed a direct threat to England All these factors forced England and France to patch up their differences

The two countries concluded Anglo-French Alliances in 1904 This treaty is commonly known as Entente Cordiate Originally it was not a military pact but both the signatories saw the growth of Germany as a naval power and experienced her hostile attitude towards France Hence, in course of time, both England and France signed a military pact against Germany to have control over the Mediterranean seas

9. The Anglo-Russian Alliance (1907) Though there were strained relations between England and Russia both were eager to join hands Russia desired to improve friendship with England to avoid further conflict with Japan with whom England had entered into an alliance in 1902 England also sought reconciliation between Japan and Russia Therefore on August 31, 1907 Anglo-Russian Alliance came into existence It was a complement to the treaty entered into by England and France It aimed at maintaining the Balance of Power to counteract the expansionist tendencies of the Triple Alliance concluded by Germany, Austria and Italy

In pre-1914 period in Europe no nation was satisfied despite several treaties, alliances and military pacts The imperialistic ambitions of the European powers and their constant search for colonies and markets led to the competition, conflict and rivalry among them The whole Europe was divided into two camps—(i) Triple Entente the camp consisting of Britain, France and Russia and (ii) Triple alliance the camp composed of Germany, Austria and Italy Both of these camps stood at opposite poles Each tried for supremacy over other The parties to the Triple Entente were very sincere They were ready to sacrifice their own personal interests at the call of common action They were fully prepared to contain their common foe—the might of Germany On the other hand, the parties to the Triple Alliance were not loyal For instance, Italy proved herself disloyal to the Triple Alliance The consolidation of France, Russia and England into a Triple Entente aimed to encircle Germany The Germans believed that it aimed at strangling German commercial and colonial expansion and even at crushing Germany's political

and military position by that time. This situation produced acute bitterness between Germany and the Parties to the Triple Entente. This flared up in the World War I in 1914.

COURSES AND EVENTS OF WORLD WAR I

After the murder of Ferdinand, on June 28, 1914, Austria held Serbia responsible for the crime and declared war against her. Russia extended a strong helping hand to Serbia. This attitude of Russia offended Germany who sent an ultimatum to Russia for stopping mobilization. On its refusal to accept demobilization, Germany declared war against Russia on August 1, 1914. On August 5, 1914, Austria also declared war on Russia. As Prof. Fay puts it, "It was primarily Russian general mobilization when Germany was trying to bring that capital Austria to a settlement, which precipitated the final catastrophy causing Germany to mobilize and develop war."

In course of time the entire Europe became involved in war. Following are the important courses and events which took place in World War I.

(i) Germany's Declaration of War on European powers and attack on Belgium.
(ii) German attack on France.
(iii) Role of Russia and Romania.
(iv) Japan's declaration of war on Germany.
(v) War in Mesopotamia and Asia Minor.
(vi) Italy's Role.
(vii) Russian Revolution.
(viii) Participation of U.S.A.

1. Germany's Declaration of War on European powers and Attack on Belgium. Germany declared war on Russia on August 1, 1914. She sought to defeat all powers around her territory. The German troops entered Luxemburg. Violating the neutral position of Luxemburg, Germany captured it. Now the German troops marched ahead into Belgium. They thought that they would be capable of capturing Paris easily within weeks after over running Belgium in time. But Germany experienced difficulty in capturing Belgium within the expected time limit. The Belgians offered massive resistance and held Germany at bay for several days. But ultimately Belgium surrendered and it was occupied by Germany on the 20th August, 1914. The surrender of Belgium upset France which was passing through anxious moments since August 20, 1914.

2. German attack on France. After the defeat of Belgium German troops captured the big port of Namur. Now the German army entered France, captured Amiens and Loan and entered Paris. The French Government was compelled to shift from Paris.

3. Role of Russia and Romania The Russian mobilization in support of Serbia prompted Germany to declare war Russian army made a thrust across the frontiers in order to divert the attention of Germany from the Russian cities It surprised both Austria and Germany Another Russian army advanced into the Eastern territory of Prussia through Poland But the German army was so strong and vigilant that both of these Russian armies were defeated by Germany Russia suffered a heavy loss On the other hand Romania declared war on Germany on August 22, 1916 getting help from Russia Romania suffered a serious defeat at Rothen Thurn pass The axis powers—Germany, Austria and Turkey occupied major parts of Romania and its oil fields On May 7, 1918, Romania was forced to enter into a treaty at Bucharest Under it, Romania had to surrender its oil fields and other economic resources to the conquerors Thus the victory over Romania strengthened the position of Germany and she gained the key ports in the Black sea

4. Japan's Declaration of war on Germany. From the very beginning Germany's attitude towards Japan was not cordial Hence Japan was bound to treat Germany likewise Germany had already declared that Japan should *not occupy any territory on mainland of Asia She demanded surrender of Liaotang, which she had taken possession of from China in 1885 To give a fatal blow* to Germany, Japan was always anxious to join hands with great powers like Britain France and U S A Hence Japan declared war against Germany

5 War in Mesopotamia and Asia Minor. Being the member of the Axis Powers, Turkey was anxious to recover her territories ceded to the Balkan countries To secure control over the Mediterranean Sea, he joined the Central Powers She succeeded impairing the British initiatives on Pallipoli peninsula and Mesopotamia The Allied Powers advanced their armies towards the eastern frontiers of Turkey On the other hand, the British army re-captured Kut and occupied Baghdad, though territory of Turkey was divided between Russia, France and Britain The Allied Powers decided to establish an Arab State between the French and British territories in the occupied areas Greece also joined hands with Allied Powers and took active part in war On September 30, 1918, the thrust of the Allied Forces in that area brought about the surrender of Bulgaria

6. Italy's Role Since the formation of the Triple Alliance, Italy was not at all satisfied with these Powers She was in search of some other alliance to join to strengthen her position The Allies were anxious to bring Italy to their side The war provided Italy with a good opportunity to make territorial adjustment with regard to her frontiers After leaving the Triple Alliance, Italy entered into the Treaty of London in 1915 and subsequently declared war against Austria, a signatory to the Triple Alliance The Treaty of London weakened the military strategy of Germany

7. Russian Revolution. Revolution in Russia in 1917 brought about a turning point in the world war. The Czar was overthrown. The Bolsheviks captured power under the leadership of Lenin. Lenin was against war and preferred peace to bring about socialism in Russia. The internal conditions of Russia were such as to make her withdraw from the conflict and devoted her energies for the struggle for the betterment of the people within the nation. Hence Russia started negotiation with Germany and Austria. In December 1917, Russia entered into a treaty with Germany and Austria. Under this treaty Russia had to surrender her territories producing 73% of oil and 89% of total coal. Besides this, it had to pay heavy damages amounting to 30 lacs of pounds. Estonia was ceded to Germany and Turkey got Kars, Ardapan and Batoum. Ukraine was separated from Russia and given independent status. Russia suffered a huge loss yet war on the eastern frontiers of Europe came to its end in 1918.

8. Participation of U.S.A. From the very start, U.S.A. maintained isolationist policy, since the beginning of the First World War though the Allied Powers made several attempts to involve her. When Lusitania—a British merchant ship was destroyed by a German torpedo on May 7, 1915 some American nationals were killed along with 2000 passengers. The U.S.A. lodged a protest note to Germany. Germany gave assurances not to sink vessels without warning and providing safety for human life. But she did not stick to her pledge. The announcement of unrestricted German submarine warfare early in 1917, brought the U.S.A. into the war on April 5, 1917. This lightened the burden of the Allied Powers and encouraged them. The combined strength of the Allied led to the discomfiture of Germany. Bulgaria surrendered in 1918. Turkey and Austria sought armistice. Germany was left alone on the scene of battle. The Allied Powers conveyed the terms of armistice to Germany on November 8, 1918. Germany had to accept it with a heavy heart. On November 11, 1918 the World War I came to its end. Hall and Davis have brilliantly summed up the state of Europe at the time of American intervention in the following words: "Russia was helpless; Italy was reeling; France was bleeding white and very tired Britain was carrying gallantly but without dauntless confidence that inspired her sacrifices of 1915-16. America was still 3,000 miles across the Atlantic."

Agadir Crisis

Before the outbreak of World War I, there were two storm centres where war could break loose over the world—the Balkans and Morocco, out of Algeria's Settlement of 1906. Second Moroccan crisis known as 'Agadir', arose in 1911. Agadir was the Moroccan port to which the Germany sent a warship. After several weeks during which Britain again supported France, the affair was settled by compromise. By ceding some colonial territory elsewhere to the Germans, France secured the recognition of the rights she claimed in Morocco. This removed the late direct cause to dispute between France and Germany. But there remained the Balkans. In the Balkans question involved was the fate

of the Austro-Hungarian Empire whose rule was extended in Bosnia in Serbia In order to unite their nationals under their flag they desired the break-up of the Empire of the Hapsburgs The hostility between Vienna and Belgrade was intense Germany thought herself obliged to support her ally Austria-Hungary and Russia to support the Serb interest in the Balkans

Chain of Crisis

The expulsion of the Turks by the armies of Serbia Greece and Bulgaria from Macedonia and Thrace was long overdue It greatly increased the tension between Austria-Hungary and her southern neighbours After her victory over *the Turks, Serbia emerged as military power to free all Yugoslavs still* under Austrian rule The rulers of Austria threatened war on this issue to maintain the territories of the Empire intact War was averted in 1913 because Grey used his good offices as mediator Germany helped the work of peace

The Austrian Archduke Francis Ferdinand was murdered at Sarajevo on June 28, 1914 The statesmen and soldiers incharge of Austro-Hungarian policy were determined not merely to get guarantees for redemption of Bosnian Yugoslavs but to seize the opportunity of the Sarajevo murder to annihilate Serbia by war, even at the risk of interference of Russia, whom they trusted Germany to keep off Unfortunately, though not really desiring war, the Kaiser and his Chancellor Bethmanu-Hollweg gave Vienna a 'blank cheque' on July 5 to send ultimatum to Belgrade The ultimatum on July 23, struck a great ıise as such demands had never been made of an independent State ɔrey realised the gravity of situation and pressed on Germany for mediation Though not approving his ally's posture of ultimatum, Germany did not agree with Grey for convening a conference to mediate She declared that it was an affair between Austria Hungary and Serbia Germany also made it clear that neither Russia nor any other country of Europe was concerned with the dispute Such an attitude of Germany meant destruction of Serbia's independence Germany sent ultimatum to Russia and her ally France German forces advanced westward against France in August though innocent Belgium endangered her independence

Thus the quarrel threatened to put an end to the independence of France and Belgium The victory of the Central powers would have meant the sub-section of Europe into an Empire better calculated to survive and to rule in perpetuity than Napoleon The very virtues of the German people, created the danger of permanent slavery for Europe Sir Edward Grey made every effort to avert the war He thereby helped to win for Britain and her Allies the moral sympathy of a large part of mankind, particularly in America *The violation of Belgian neutrality* and the invaders' treatment of Belgian resistance was a drama that brought home the dreadful facts and necessities of the hour to the unwilling mind of the British public, which craved for nothing but peace

Till the invasion of Belgium, in the first days of August, British opinion had been divided about the necessity of taking part in a European war. At the end of July, neutralist felling was very strong, especially in the liberal and labour parties. Headed by Mr. Lloyd's George, half the Cabinet was neutralist. It would, therefore, had been utterly impossible for Grey, to threaten Germany with British participation in war. Any premature attempt to commit Great Britain to fight would have led to the break-up of the cabinet, and the division of the country at the moment of its greatest peril. The danger of national division came to an end by the actual invasion of Belgium. On August 4, Great Britain went to war as a united country to protect Belgian neutrality and to prevent the fall of Paris and the Channel ports into the German power.

CAUSES OF THE WORLD WAR I

Thus the diplomatic and political background prior to 1914, the imperialist's ambitions of European Powers in particular, Germany and Italy, French desire of revenge, Italy's desire of irredentism, Austro-Russian contest for the control of Balkans, murder of Ferdinand and absence of international organisation were the principal causes of the World War I. Following factors were responsible for the outbreak of World War I :

1. Division of Europe into two camps.
2. Expansionist Tendency of the European Nations.
3. Militarism.
4. Germany's challenge to Great Britain.
5. Hostile and biased attitude of Press at Work.
6. French desire to seek revenge against Germany.
7. Italy's concept of Irredentism.
8. Austro-Russian Contest for Control of Balkans.
9. Absence of any international organisation.
10. Idea of cultural Superiority of Germany.
11. Murder of Arch Duke Ferdinand.
12. The Berlin-Baghdad Railway Project.
13. Violation of Belgium's Neutrality by Germany.

1. Division of Europe into two Camps. In pre-1914 period Europe was divided into two camps created by two different alliances; one the *Triple Entente* consisting of Britain, France and Russia and the other the *Triple Alliance* composed of Germany, Austria and Italy. The consolidation of France, Russia and England resulted in encirclement of Germany. The Germans believed that this encirclement aimed at strangling German

commercial and colonial expansion and crushing her political and military position by that time The situation in Europe looked like a huge heap of powder magazine which could be set ablaze by a single match Almost all powers were in search of colonies and markets This caused rivalries and tensions among them making war inevitable

2. Expansionist Attempts of the European Nations England, France, Germany, Italy, etc industrialised states of Europe began to produce goods and capital in abundance This required sources of raw-materials, markets and colonies for investment of surplus capital This imperialist ambition of the European powers was responsible for the outbreak of World War I

3. Militarism. *In order to fulfil their objective in supremacy and* colonization, the most industrially advanced nations of Europe began to increase their armies and to equip themselves with the latest weapons They fully engaged in arms race for defence and national security A bitter competition took place among them This created a condition which led to widespread conflict among them War became imminent in course of short time

4. Germany's Challenge to Great Britain England had become the most industrialized nation in pre-1914 era She had established a vast empire with a long fleet of ships She had emerged as a supreme naval power recognised by others It was an eye-sore to European nations which became jealous of England

The unified Germany posed a threat and a serious challenge to the British imperial hegemony Bismarck—the German Chancellor began to prepare German nation for the final combat with England When England was fighting Boer War in South Africa, Germany criticised her step Since then the natural relation between the two was finished William II, the German Emperor made a declaration that his nation was no longer satisfied with the British supremacy upon the continent of Europe Germany proclaimed herself to be one of the world's powers The arrogant behaviour of William II and his wrong assessment of the British power was one of the major factors in World War I

5. Hostile and biased attitude of Press at work. During pre-1914 periods, the newspapers belonging to the rival camps created conflict situation The German Press published the exaggerated reports of the atrocities committed by the British armies in Boer War in South Africa Newspapers of other countries adopted similar attitude against Germany and published prejudiced and biased news This tirade against each other caused frictions and tensions in opposite camps Being engaged in false propaganda against each other the press of hostile camps spreaded distrust and animosity between England and Germany

6. French desire of Revenge against Germany France always thought of a war of revenge upon Germany to get back her lost territory since the

occupation of Alsace-Lorraine by Germany in the Franco-Prussian War of 1870. During the regime of Delcasse—the French Foreign Minister, France thought that she would not be able to get back Alsace-Lorraine without the help of England. Hence she entered into the Anglo-French Alliance. This was further strengthened by a military alliance in which the two countries agreed to carry out military preparations in co-ordination with each other and assist one another in case of war with Germany. After the conclusion of this military alliance, France searched an opportunity to give a fatal blow to Germany.

7. Italy's Concept of "Irredentism". In pre-1914 era, the Italians were concerned about Trentino and the areas around the port of Trieste. These were inhabited by the Italian but occupied by Austria-Hungary. The Italian leaders wanted to liberate these lost territories. By the movement of "Italia Irredena" or "he redeemed Italy", Italy joined hands with Germany and Austria in Triple Alliance and challenged the *status quo*. But she could not be successful and found Germany unsuitable for friendship. Therefore, she left the Triple Alliance and signed a secret treaty with England in London in 1915. This created bitterness between Austria-Hungary and Italy, ultimately it led war between the two.

8. Austro-Russian Contest for Control of Balkans. Prior to 1914, the Balkans presented a complicated situation. Since the French Revolution, the Christian subjects of the Ottoman Emperor in the Balkan countries were yearning for independence and national self-determination. When conflict arose between Bulgaria, Greece and Serbia for the control of Macedonia, the situation became difficult. Russia sided with Serbia but both Russia and Germany were the provinces of the Balkans were annexed by Austria. Russia not only supported Serbia, but came forward as her protector, when Serbia issued slogan for "Bigger Serbia". This created tension between Austria and Russia. In Europe every powerful country was interested to occupy the provinces of the Balkan countries. This created a terrific war-mindedness in European Powers waiting for a spark to start the fire of holocaust.

9. Absence of International Organisation. The Hague Conferences of 1899 and 1907 had failed to codify the rules of international conduct. Therefore, absence of any world organisation to regulate and control the conduct of states was also a cause of the World War I.

10. Idea of Cultural Superiority of Germany. Germans thought themselves superior to the people of other nations, in race and culture. The Germans believed that a victorious nation is morally justified and the vanquished is immoral. This made war a national industry of Germany.

11. The Berlin-Baghdad Railway Project. Germany launched the Berlin-Baghdad railway project. This created bitterness in Russian. Russia thought that her influence in the eastern Mediterranean would be badly affected, if this project is completed. Germany remained anxious to complete

the project in time despite the Russian opposition As both these countries did not arrive at any compromise formula bitterness between the two increased to the maximum

12 Murder of Arch Duke Ferdinand. The immediate cause of the World War I was the murder of Arch Duke Ferdinand heir to the Austrian throne on June 28, 1914 by a member of a Serbian society of terrorist called the Blackhand It flared up the fire of animosity between Serbia and Austria The Austrians held Serbia responsible for the murder of Ferdinand Serbia declared war against Austria Russia started mobilization to extend assistance to Serbia Germany sent an ultimatum to Russia for demobilization but Russia refused it This Russian refusal annoyed Germany On August 1, 1914, Germany declared war against Russia Great Britain also entered the fray soon after this declaration of war

13. Violation of Belgium's Neutrality by Germany. Belgium had become a neutral country by the International Treaty of 1839 England was one of the signatories to this treaty In the offensive plan against France when the German troops entered the territory of Belgium, the neutrality of Belgium was violated This drew England and France into the war Within five weeks of the murder of Ferdinand the entire Europe was plunged into the World War I Even the U S A became involved in it Japan penetrated into the Chinese mainland World War I came to its end when Germany surrendered on November 11, 1918 It has been described as the "worst disaster to Western mankind since the Black Death"

DIFFICULTIES IN PARIS PEACE CONFERENCE

The First World War continued for 1565 days It involved mobilization of 65 million men, of whom 13 million had been wounded and 7 million had died in action or of injuries In terms of money it cost £270,000,000,000 It was brought to an end by the Treaty of Versailles and four other treaties concluded at various places by the Allies with the defeated powers However, the conclusion of the Peace Treaties was not smooth The Conference had to face a number of initial problems The chief difficulties encountered by the Peace Conference were as follows

1. Unwieldy gathering The unwieldy nature of the gathering was the chief hurdle in the way of smooth negotiation 1037 delegates of various descriptions attended the Paris Peace Conference Almost all these representatives, as Landsman has said, "came to attend the Paris Peace Conference well-equipped with records and memoranda" The opinions and counter-opinions of the experts added to the difficulties of reaching an agreed decision

2. Absence of well-defined principles. The absence of well-defined principles regarding the future reconstruction of the world stood in the way

of the leaders in finding any formula or a definite plan. Due to the conflicting interests it was difficult to find an agreed solution of the post-war problems.

3. Wrong Seat of Conference. The selection of Paris as the seat of Conference was also not wise since a lot of fighting and destruction had taken place in its neighbourhood and unhappy memories were bound to effect the conclusions of the Congress. If a neutral city like Geneva or Lausanne had been selected as an avenue for the Peace Conference, it would have been better.

4. Conflicting Approaches of Leaders. The four world leaders—Wilson (U.S.A), Lloyd George (U. K.), Clemenceau (France) and Orlando (Italy) entrusted with the responsibility of taking a decision had no identity of interests. Wilson wanted to establish a long and durable peace based upon justice and neutrality instead of taking revenge upon the enemy. Clemenceau and Orlando were more keen to protect the territorial interests of France and Italy respectively and did not bother by the problem of 'world peace'. Lloyd George though eager to establish international peace on the basis of truth and justice, was willing to do all this only if the conference were not hindered by the conflicting approaches adopted by the leaders.

5. Secret Treaties. During the course of the war many secret treaties had been concluded by different states to preserve their mutual self-interests. In view of the eagerness of powers like Great Britain, France, Italy and Japan to observe the terms of these secret treaties, Wilson was ultimately forced to compromise although he was not in favour of secret diplomacy. To quote Langsam: "Wilson's idealism came into sharp conflict with materialism at Conference and in most cases materialism triumphed".

However, peace was concluded in spite of all these difficulties. The Peace Settlement consisted of five treaties—the Treaty of Versailles (June 28, 1919) concluded with Germany; the Treaty of Germany (September 10, 1919) concluded with Austria; the Treaty of Neuily concluded with Bulgaria (November 27, 1919); the Treaty of Trianon (June 4, 1920) concluded with Turkey. The Treaty of Hungary; and the Treaty of Sevres (August 10, 1920) concluded with Turkey. The Treaty of Sevres was revised in the Conference at Lausanne in 1923. Peace was formally established only on August 6, 1924, when the Treaty of Lausanne came into force.

THE TREATY OF VERSAILLES

Procedure of Treaty

The Treaty of Versailles was signed between the Allies and the Germany on June 28, 1919. It dictated peace. The German delegates were not allowed to discuss the treaty with the Allies. The draft of the Treaty was presented to the German Foreign Minister on May 7, 1919. Three weeks time was given to Germany to give written objections, if any.

Voluminous objections to the treaty were received from the Germans on May 29 Clemenceau adopted a stiff attitude although Lloyd George proposed certain concessions After a few minor alterations in the original treaty Germany revised the treaty They were warned that their country would be invaded if they failed to do so As Germany was in the throes of a famine therefore, the German Assembly accepted the terms of the treaty with the exception of provisions relating to the punishment of the German war-guilts and surrender of war criminals The Allies demanded unconditional acceptance of the treaty The Germans had no other alternative Hence they signed the Treaty on June 28, 1919

PROVISIONS OF THE TREATY

The Treaty of Versailles was a voluminous document containing 440 articles Its various provisions may be studied under the following headings

1. Territorial Provisions The Treaty of Versailles affected substantial territorial changes Germany restored back to France Alsace and part of Lorraine which she had taken from her in 1871 Belgium got back Eupen and Malmedy She got Moresnet in partial compensation for the destruction of her forests by the Germans Germany agreed to give Upper Silesia and the Southern part of East Prussia to Poland if the people concerned were in favour of joining it which was to be ascertained through a plebiscite When the plebiscite was actually held the decision was in favour of a complete merger with Germany However, Poland insisted that she must get areas having Polish majority The League Council partitioned Silesia on the insistence of France It left more than half of the area and population to Germany Industrialised areas were given to Poland Taken away from Germany, Danzing was set up as a Free City under the League of Nations Poland was given special rights in the city of Danzing

The Saar valley was given under the control of an international commission and the League France was given the exclusive rights of exploitation of coal mines of the Valley A plebiscite was to be held after 15 years to ascertain whether the inhabitants wanted to return to Germany, to unite with France or to remain under the league The people of Saar Valley voted for Germany when the plebiscite was actually held

Mamel was ceded to the principal Allies It was handed over to Lithuania in 1924 As a result of a plebiscite held in two zones Germany lost northern Schleswig to Denmark The Union of Germany and Austria was forbidden until the unanimous consent of the League Council, where France had permanent seat

Germany had to renounce all her over—seas possessions and colonies to the League, which were distributed among the victorious powers including Great Britain France, Belgium, Japan, the Union of South Africa, New Zealand

and Australia as mandates of the League. Japan got the lease of Kiao-Chow. The German portion of the island of Samoa were left to the care of New Zealand.

Australia was entrusted with the administration of German New Guiana. Togoland and Tanganyika were placed under the British administration. Certain parts of Tanganyika were left under Belgium. Cameroons were given to France. Union of South Africa got the administrative rights over German South-West Africa. Thus Germany lost nearly ninety lakh square miles area. The loss was accompanied by a blow to the German pride since the Allies tried to justify their rule over the colonies by asserting that the German treatment of the native population in her colonies had been cruel and arbitrary.

2. Military Provisions. The Treaty of Versailles was an effort to cripple the military strength of Germany once for all. She was allowed a voluntary army of one lakh soldiers though without modern equipments along with a small navy and merchant marine. The German navy was limited to six battleships, six light cruisers, 12 destroyers and 12 torpedo boats. The treaty absolutely forbade naval or military air forces for Germany. It imposed restrictions on the manufacture of arms and Germany was forbidden either to make or to purchase from outside tanks, armoured cars and poison gases. The Rhineland was demilitarised. Germany was forbidden to maintain or construct any fortifications either on the left bank of the Rhine or on the right bank to the west of a line drawn 50 kilometres to the east of the Rhine. The existing fortifications were to be destroyed. No military force was to be maintained in that area. The harbors of the islands of Heligoland and Dune were to be demilitarized. Fortifications were to be demolished.

3. Economic Provisions. The Treaty of Versaillies aimed at keeping Germany economically weak. Germany was held responsible for the loss and damage caused during the war. She was asked to pay compensation to "Allied and Associated Governments". Article 231 stipulated that "the Allied and associated Governments affirm and Germany accepts the responsibility of Germany and her allies for causing all the loss and damage to which the Allied and Associated Governments and their nationals have been subjected as a consequence of the war imposed upon them by the Government of Germany and her allies." But the allied Government informed that the resources of Germany were inadequate to make full compensation for all the damage done. Germany was therefore, allowed to make compensation for all damages done to the civilian population of the Allied and Associated Powers to their property, by land, by sea and from the air, and in general all damages as defined in Annexure I which contained 10 categories of losses and damages.

However, it was very difficult to arrive at an amount which Germany would pay to the Allies. Therefore a Repatriation Commission was set up consisting of the representatives if the U.S.A., Great Britain, France, Italy and Japan. On April 28, 1921 the Commission assessed the debt of Germany at

$6,600,000,000 This amount was however, successively scaled down and finally abolished in 1932 after Germany had paid about a thousand million pounds The treaty recognized the right of the Allies to the replacement, ton for ton and class for class, of all merchant ships and fishing boats lost or damaged owing to the war Large quantities of coal were to be delivered for ten years to France, Belgium and Italy Germany was also to deliver to France and Belgium a larger number of horses, cattle, sheep etc German properties in the former German colonies and in the Allied Countries were to be confiscated The pre-war trading concessions with Morocco, Egypt and China were abolished The Allies were given certain concessions for five years regarding imports into Germany and exports from Germany The German rivers Elbe and Ode were *internationalised This was to provide Switzerland and Czecho*slovakia an access to the sea The Kiel canal was internationalised, and thrown open to all ships of all nations

4. Legal Provisions. The Treaty of Versailles held Germany and her allies responsible for 'war guilts' Kaiser William II, the Emperor of Germany was charged with "the supreme offence against international morality and the sanctity of treaties" For these offences, he was to be tried by a tribunal However, the Government of Netherlands, where the Kaiser had taken shelter, refused to surrender him Germany agreed to surrender other persons 'accused of having committed acts in violation of the laws and customs of war' However, ultimately only twelve persons were prosecuted in the Courts of Germany *They were given mild punishments*

Germany was to restore all the trophies, archives, historical souvenirs, or works of art carried by her forces from France during the Franco German War or the last war Within six months of the promulgation of the treaty of Versailles, she was to return the French flags and political papers taken away during the Franco German war She was to restore the original Koran of the Caliph of Ottoman to the King of Hedjaz This had been removed from Medina by the Turkish authorities and presented to Kaiser William of Germany Germany was also to hand over the skull of the Sultan Kkwawa to Britain which was removed from the Protectorate of German East Africa and taken to Germany She was to compensate the University of Louvain for the *destruction of her manuscripts and documents She* agreed to hand over to Belgium two paintings which were at that time in Germany

5. Political Provisions The Treaty of Versailles recognized the independence of Poland and Czechoslovakia It forbade Germany to revive her customs union with Austria Germany was required to abrogate the Treaty of Breast Litovsk and other agreements with Russia She was to withdraw her troops in the east within its new frontiers The German territory West of the Rhine together with the bridgehead, was to be occupied by the Allied troops for a period of 15 years If Germany carried out her obligations faithfully, the

bridgehead at Cologne was to be evacuated after 5 years, that at Coblenz after 10 years and that at Mainz after 15 years. The occupation could be prolonged if Germany misbehaved. However, all the Germans were actually withdrawn by 1930.

6. Creation of League of Nations. The treaty of Versailles provided for the creation of the League of Nations with the primary object of maintaining international peace. It also provided for the establishment of an International Labour Organisation.

Criticism of the Treaty

The treaty of Versailles has been described as one of the most controversial documents signed by the nations in modern time. The Germans described it as a 'Dictated Peace: a treaty forced upon the vanquished by the victor', an unheard robbery of the German people, a carthagian peace. The German representatives were not consulted. The German objections to the various clauses of the treaty were over-ruled. The main points of criticism leveled against the treaty were as follows:

1. A Dictated Peace. The Treaty of Versailles was called a dictated treaty because the Germans were not consulted at all in drafting of the treaty. They were permitted to raise objections in writing only. The Allied Powers gave very scant regard to Germany who forced to sign the treaty under threat of another invasion of their country. In the words of Llyod George, "These terms are written in the blood of fallen heroes. We must carry out the edict of providence and see that the people who inflicted this (war) they will not sign. Their newspapers say they will not sign. The politicians say the same thing. We say, Gentlemen, you must sign. If you do not do so in Versailles you shall do so in Berlin."

The element of dictation however is a trail of every treaty. As E. H. Carr said, "Nearly every treaty which brings a war to an end, is in one sense a dictated peace; for a defeated power seldom accepts willingly consequences of its defeat". However, even Carr admits that in "the Treaty of Versailles the element of dictation was more apparent than in any previous peace treaties of moderns times."

Though it cannot be denied that much avoidable harshness had been allowed to be injected in the procedure, the exclusion of Germany from negotiations was imperative in view of the internal difference among the Allies. If allowed to participate in the negotiations Germany must have fully exploited the differences amongst the Allies. The revengeful attitude of Germany as manifested in the Treaty of Brest Litovsk and the Treaty of Bucharest concluded with Russia and Rumania respectively had hardened the attitude of the Allies because the "minds of the rulers of Germany were too clearly revealed by these treaties to permit of any illusion".

The Germans pointed out that they had surrendered on the basis of President Wilson s Fourteen Points The treaty of Versailles constituted breach of faith as it deviated from those points But Germany had treated Russian and Romanian appeal to the principle most harshly As David Thomson said They (Fourteen Points) were formulated in January 1918 before the treaty of Brest Litvosk had shown Germany s conception of treaty making and before the meaning of the Bolshevik Revolution had become apparent

In actual implementation however severity of the terms of the treaty of Versailles were to be very much relaxed When the repatriation payment was *finally abolished in 1932 Germany had paid only about one thousand million* pounds whereas she had received loans of about three thousand million pounds Similarly the armies of the Allies were withdrawn from the German soil before the expiry of fifteen years term Finally although the Kaiser Willian II and certain German army officers were held guilty for war crimes only a dozen of the German Military officers were tried by the German Courts and given light punishments

2 Spirit of Revenge It is said that the peace settlement in the Treaty was made in the spirit of revenge The leaders of the Peace conference were very vindictive Even Llyod George who stood for lenient treatment of Germany won the famous Khaki election with the slogan We shall hang Kaiser and make Germany pay to the last penny A lenient and kind treatment of Germany was more likely to promote peace The German humiliation was so great that she could not put up with it Germany was in the look out of an opportunity *to smash the treaty*

3 Unjust Economic and Colonial Terms The treaty imposed economic and colonial terms to cripple Germany economically As Langsam puts it The treaty of Versailles reduced the European area of Germany by one eighth and her population by 6 50 000 It deprived her of all colonies and of virtually all investments and holdings abroad She lost 15% of her arable land 12% of livestocks and almost 10% of her manufacturing establishments By her European cessions Germany lost potash iron coal zinc lead and food She surrendered about two fifths of her coal reserves nearly two-thirds of her iron ore about seven tenths of her zinc and more than half of her lead The surrender of the colonies entailed the loss of large rubber oil and fiber supplies Besides a huge amount of reparation was imposed on Germany which created serious economic crisis both in Germany and the Allied countries As Churchil observed History will characterise all these transactions as insane They helped *to breed the material curse and the economic blizzard*

4 Principles of Nationalism and Self Determination not Uniformly Followed The Treaty failed to reconstruct the map of Europe on the basis of two well accepted principle of nationalism and self determination These principles conceded to the right of creating separate and independent states to

the people of the same nationality and culture. While in case of several small independent states like Yugoslavia and Czechoslovakia these principles were observed, these were not uniformly followed. A large number of Germans of Poland and Western Prussia were left in Poland. Many Germans were left under the Slavs in Bohemia. In Dalmatia many Slavs were left under Italy. The creation of free city of Danzing which had majority of Germans under the League of Nations was a clear violation of this principle. Prohibiting the Union of Germany and Austria violated one of this principle. Thus the treaty created the minority problem, which led to many troubles in future.

5. Lack of Reciprocity. The treaty lacked the element of reciprocity with regard to disarmament, transportation, colonies, abolition of capitulations, punishment of officers etc. These provisions were completely exempted from them. Except England no Allied power agreed to disarm. Similarly 'war-crimes' was not the bane of the German officers alone. The record of Allied Armymen was also not clean. However, not even a single member of allied army was tried for 'war-crimes' the 'mandate system' could have been applied similarly, to all the colonies. The treaty of Versailles would have been just if the principle of reciprocity had been followed. Without reciprocity it was a treaty of force. It could be executed only so long as the force continued to be applied to make execute it. It was quite natural for Germany to infringe the provisions of the Treaty of Versailles at the earliest opportunity in 1936.

6. Breach of Faith. The Treaty of Versailles was a breach of faith. The promises given to Germany were not fulfilled. The treaty was not fully based on Wilson's Fourteen Points. The freedom of sea was not secured. Numerous tariff walls were created. National armaments were not reduced. German colonies were distributed among the victors.

7. Seeds of Second World War. Critics say that the seeds of Second World War lay in the Treaty of Versailles. They have pointed out that Germany was given very harsh treatment. She was stripped of her armaments. She was deprived of her colonies. She was stripped of all interests and trading privileges outside of her boundary. She was deprived of about six millions of her people. She lost some of her richest mineral districts. She was compelled to grant economic privileges to the Allies without any reciprocity. The violation of her right of self-determination further added fuel to the fire. It created a psychology of revenge among Germans.

8. More Violation than Implementation. The history of the period between the two world wars can be described as the period of more violations than the implementation. While some of the provisions of the treaty were allowed to lapse, other were repudiated by Germany and some were violated in the teeth of opposition.

9 Amendments and Infringements It has been rightly said that no other great diplomatic instrument has been modified, revised or infringed in the same way as the Treaty of Versailles In 1926, Part I of the Treaty was amended to enable Germany to get the membership of the League of Nations In 1935 Part V of the Treaty dealing with provisions related to military, navy and air force, was violated by Germany Part VII of the treaty dealing with the war criminals was allowed to go by default Part VIII, dealing with reparation, was modified by the Reparation Commission the Dawes Committees (1924) the Young Committee (1929) and the Hoover Moratorium (1931) It was given a decent burial by World Economic Conference Part II and III dealing with the western, northern and eastern boundaries of Germany were violated by Germany with the consent of the Allies The other infringements were promulgation of new military laws by Germany, conclusion of Naval Treaty with England in 1935, occupation of Austria by Germany in 1938, and the occupation of Bohemia and Moravia by Germany in 1939

10. Unsatisfactory Patch works Being a patch work the Treaty of Versailles could satisfy neither the victors nor the vanquished

11. Lack of Observance The Allies never bothered to ensure strict observance of the provisions of the Treaty "Rigorous enforcement of the treaty might have convinced Germany not only that it had lost the war, but also that war did not pay Once the Allies began not to enforce the treaty and to modify it, they lost all chances of reconciling Germany to its provisions and encouraged to nullify them " Lack of will on the part of Allies to enforce the provisions of the Treaty encouraged Germany to throw it to the wind as soon as she could

ROLE OF PRESIDENT WILSON

On November 11, 1918 Germany surrendered to the Allies on the basis of the Fourteen Points enunciated by President Wilson of U S A in his address to the Congress on January 8 1918 These fourteen points known as Wilsonian *Principles, provided for the following*

1 Open covenants of peace Peace was to be openly arrived at by public diplomacy

2. Absolute freedom of navigation The seas outside the territorial waters, were to be free both in peace and war

3. Removal of all economic barriers This included establishment of an equality of trade conditions among all the nations

4. Reduction of national armaments This was to be done to the lowest point consistent with domestic safety

5. Impartial adjustment of all colonial claims This was based upon a strict observance of the principle that in determining all such questions of sovereignty, the interests of the people must be given equal weight with the equitable claims of the Government

6. Evacuation of all Russian territory. This included providing her an opportunity for the independent determination of her own political development and national policy. Russia was assured of a sincere welcome into the society of free nations under institutions of her own choice.

7. Evacuation of and restorations of Belgium. This was to be done without making an attempt to limit her sovereignty.

8. Evacuations and restoration of Alsace-Lorraine to France. This was taken away from France by Prussia in 1971. It was to be restored to secure the peace.

9. Readjustment of the frontiers of Italy. This was to be done along clearly recognisable lines of nationality.

10. Free opportunity to Austria and Hungary. This was necessary for autonomous development.

11. Evacuation of Romania, Serbia and Montenegro. This included free access to Serbia to the sea, and determination of relations of several Balkan states along historically established lines of allegiance and nationality.

12. Assurance of sovereignty to the Turkish portions of the Ottoman Empire. This included undoubted security of life to other nationalities under Turkish rule as well as free passage to the ships and commerce of all nations through the Dardanelles, under international guarantees.

13. An independent state of Poland. This was to be done with access to the sea. The political and economic independence and territorial integrity of the state was to be guarantied by international covenant.

14. The creation of an intonation organisation. This was to guarantee independence and territorial integrity to great and small states alike.

Summing up his Fourteen Points in a subsequent address, President Wilson observed "What we are striving for is a new international order based upon the broad and universal principle of right and justice— no more peace of shreds and patches. Peoples and provinces are not to be bartered about from sovereignty to sovereignty, as if they were mere cattles and pawns in a game, even the great game now for ever discredited, of the balance of power."

WILSONIAN TREATY

Opposing Facts

The Germans claimed that the promises made by Wilson were not fulfilled. Harold Nilcholson did not agree that the Treaty was a Wilsonaian Treaty. He argued that open covenants were not openly arrived at, seldom has such secrecy been maintained in any diplomatic gathering. The freedom of the seas was not secured. Far from free trade being established in Europe a set of tariff walls were erected. The national armaments were not reduced by all the powers. This provision was applied only in the case of

Germany The German colonies were distributed among the victors in a manner which was neither free nor open-minded, nor impartial The wishes of the people were flagrantly violated in case of Saar, Shantung and Syria Although all German armies were withdrawn from Russian soil, the Allies did not hesitate to send their army to exterminate the Bolshevic government of Russia Russia was not welcome into the society of the nations She was not accorded unhampered freedom to develop her own institutions The frontiers of Italy were not adjusted along the lines of rationality Austrians and Slavs were left in the re-organised Italy Wilson's promise of independence to the different races of the defunct Austro-Hungarian empire was not fulfilled Many Austrians and Magyars were left under foreign domination The territories of Poland included many people who were indisputably not Polish The Turkish portions of the Ottoman Empire were not assured a secure sovereignty although the Allied armies were withdrawn from Romania, Serbia and Montenegro The League of Nations was not in a position to assure political independence to all the states The territorial settlements were based on adjustments and compromises between the claims of the rival states The people were treated as mere pawns and cattles in the game of power politics

Favourbale Facts

1. **French Settlement 1919-20** Although the Fourteen Points of Wilson had to be compromised in many ways with a view to adjusting them the mutual commitments of the Allies, yet many of them found their way into the French Settlement of 1919-20

2. **League of Nations** The Covenant of the League would not have been drafted and placed within the framework of the treaties without the whole-hearted support of President Wilson

3 **Self-Determination.** The Treaty of Versailles paid great respect to Wilsonian principle of self determination The Poles, Croats, Czechs, Lette, Finns, Alsatinas, etc , were released from subjection to the alien rule No previous settlement paid so much attention to the principle of Nationality as in the Treaty of Versailles

4. **Great Emancipator.** The Treaty of Versailles was a 'great emancipator' At the commencement of World War I in 1914, there were about 40 million people living under the alien rule, but in 1919, there number came down to 16 millions

5 **Protection of Minorities.** The Treaty of Versailles made an all out effort to do everything possible to protect the minorities Undoubtedly in certain cases the problem of minorities could not be solved satisfactorily and certain 'ethnic anomalies' were left But in fact no settlement can completely solve the territorial and minority problems

6. Other Achievements. The other achievements of the Treaty of Versailles, in accordance with the Fourteen Points of Wilson, included the creation of independent states of Yugoslavia, Poland and Czechoslovakia, and restoration of Alsace-Lorraine to France, which had disturbed the peace of Europe for such a long time.

Limitations of Wilsonian Principle

1. Political Oratory. The treaty of Versailles deviated from Wilson's Fourteen Points at various places, because the principles enunciated by President Wilson were "merely a piece of political oratory incapable of exact interpretations". They could not form the basis of a binding international agreement. As the principle aimed at the establishment of a new world order they could not be fully incorporated in a treaty concluded with a single nation—Germany.

2. Mutual Contradictions. Some of Wilson's principles were mutually contradictory. For example, the ban on Austro-German Union imposed by the Treaty, at first seems to be a negation of the principle of national self-determination. But if the union had been permitted, it would have meant repudiation of 'essential justice' and posed a threat to 'permanent peace'. Again, the application of the principle of self-determination in certain cases would have meant a repudiation of the principle that 'each part of the final settlement must be based on the essential justice of that particular case'.

3. Revengeful German Attitude. The revengeful attitude adopted by Germans in the Treaties of Brest-Litovsk and Bucharest concluded with Russia and Romania respectively, convinced the Allies that Germany had no regard for the Wilsonian Principle. As Wilsonian principles were drafted before the above two treaties were concluded, the German conception of treaty making was quite apparent. Therefore, Germans were not justified in saying that the Treaty of Versailles was a breach of faith.

MINOR TREATIES

The first World War stared on July 28, 1914 with the declaration of war by Austria against Serbia. It lasted upto November 11,1918, when the allied powers agreed to sign an armistice with Germany. But it took five years to finalise the Peace Settlement. At the Peace Conference of Paris, apart from the Treaty of Versailles concluded with Germany on June 28, 1919, four other treaties were also signed with the allies of Germany. These included the Treaty of St. Germain signed with Austria on September 10, 1919, the Treaty of Neuilly signed with Bulgaria on November 27, 1919; the Treaty of Trianon signed with Hungary on June 4, 1920 and the Treaty of Sevres signed with Turkey on August 10, 1920. The last treaty actually came into force on August 6, 1924 after it was revised in the Conference held at Lausanne. Following are the terms and significance of these 'minor treaties'.

1. The Treaty of Saint Germain It was signed with Austria on September 10, 1919 To a large extent it was modelled on the Treaty of Versailles It recognized the independence of Hungary, Poland and Yugoslavia She ceded South Tyrol Trentino, Trieste, Istria and Dalmatian Islands to Italy, Bukovina to Romania, Bosinia, Herzegovine and the Dalmatian coast to Yugoslavia, Moravia, part of lower Austria and Austrian Silesia to Czechoslovakia Austrian Galecio to Poland and Treschen to Poland and Czechoslovakia Thus three-fourth of the territory and people were detached from Austria

The Treaty of St Germain forbade the union between Austria and Germany It greatly curtailed the military and naval power of Austria Austria's army was reduced to 30 000 volunteers and her navy was reduced to three police boats on the Danube Austria was accorded access to the Adriatic Sea across the territories that formerly formed part of the Hapsburg domain Austria asserted to blank reparation cheque She acknowledged the right of the Allies to try Austrian 'war criminals' However, all claims of reparation from Austria were repudiated in 1921 The Reparation Commission appointed to realise compensation for war damages was turned into a relief organisation The Articles of the Treaty of Versailles concerning the Covenant of the League of Nations and I L O were also adopted in the treaty

2. The Treaty of Neuilly. It was signed with Bulgaria on November 27, 1919 The western part of Bulgaria, though inhabited by a large Bulgarian majority was ceded to Yugoslavia Western Thrace and the Aegean coasts were ceded to Greece Bulgaria was guaranteed access to the Aegean sea The army of Bulgaria was reduced to 33,000 men Her navy was practically abolished For police and fishery duties she was allowed four torpedo boats and six motor boats, though all these were to be without torpedoes and torpedo apparatus Bulgaria accepted reparation obligations The reparations were finally fixed at $ 9,000,000 payable in 37 years commencing from January 1, 1921 Thus the treaty deprived Bulgaria of 2750 sq miles of territory and 300,000 people It made her the weakest of the Balkan States beside Albania in area national resources and military power

3. The Treaty of Trianon It was signed on June 20, 1920 with the national government of Hungary at Treanon It dissolved the ancient Magyar kingdom into its ethnic components Rumania received Transylvania and some other territories including a part of Banat of Temesvar Crotia and Slavonia were ceded to Yogoslavia Slovakia was given to Czechoslovakia Thus nearly 3 million of Magyars were placed under foreign rule

Hungarian army was reduced to 35,000 men Her navy was curtailed to a few patrol boats She was held responsible for war-guilts She had to pay war reparation These provisions of the treaty reduced Hungary to one-third of pre-war territory and 40 per cent of her population The treaty also sowed seeds of the acute racial disturbances and animosities, which occurred later

4. The Treaty of Sevres. It was signed on August 10,1920 with Turkey. It actually came into force on August 6, 1924. It was also modelled on the Treaty of Versailles. According to the terms of the Treaty of Sevres, Asia Minor, Thrace, Adrianople and Gallipoli were given to Greece, Syria to France and Palestine and Mesopotamia to England. The King of Hedjaj was declared independent. The state of Turkey was restricted within the Asia Minor. The Turkish army was reduced to 50,000. Turkey surrendered all her Air Force to the Allies. The Turkish ports of Constantinople, Alexandria etc. were placed under international control. Turkey was charged with war-guilt but the reparation claims were waived in her case.

Due to the successful opposition staged by the nationalist party under Mustafa Kamal Pasha, these terms of the Treaty could not be put into force. In the meanwhile a war broke out between Turkey and Greece over Smyrna. On November 1, 1922 the Sultanate was abolished. On November 20, 1922 negotiations for peace between Nationalist Turkey and Allies were opened at Lausanne. The Conference at Lausanne lasted till July 24, 1923. It was attended by Britain, France, Italy, Japan, Greece, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia. U.S.A. participated as an observer. The Conference signed in all 17 agreements of which the Treaty of Lausanne was the most important. Turkey got most favourbale terms, though she agreed to give up Trans-Jordan, Palestine, Mesopotamia, Syria and Hedjaz. She was allowed to retain the whole of Anatolia, Adrianople, Eastern Thrace, Symrna, Galacia, Adalia, etc. The Treaty did not impose any limitations on the Turkish navy and military. Turkey became independent in the economic sphere. Thus Turkey achieved virtually all that she had demanded in the National Pact.

5. Minorities Treaties. A number of new states came into being as a consequence of the various treaties. Thus created the problem of security of minorities. As the important minorities were left, something had to be done to safeguard their interests, for this purpose the Paris Conference appointed a New States Committee to consider the question of minority safeguards. This Committee steered "a course which would, on the one hand avoid giving so much autonomy to minorities as to constitute them states within the states, and on the other hand, providing so little protections for them that their position might become precarious". On the basis of this peace treaties were concluded with Austria, Hungary, Bulgaria and Turkey a broad pattern of minority rights and safeguards were prepared. The Allied Powers concluded separate minorities treaties with Czechoslovakia (Sept. 10, 1919), Yugoslavia (Sept. 10, 1919), Romania (December 9, 1919), Greece (August 10, 1920), and Armenia (August 10, 1920). In some cases the states concluded bi-lateral minority treaties also. These Minorities Treaties recognised political, economic, cultural and humanitarian rights of the minority communities. The League of Nations was authorised to exercise supervision over the minority guarantees. These guarantees could be modified only with the consent of majority of the League Council.

QUESTIONS FOR EXERCISE

1 Discuss briefly the political events that led to the outbreak of the First World War

2 What were the important courses and events that took place during the First World War ? Discuss in brief

3 Discuss briefly the causes of the First World War

4 Write short note on the difficulties in Paris Peace Conference

5 "It (Versaille's Treaty) is not peace It is an armistice for twenty years " (Marshal Foch) Comment

6 "The terms of the Treaty of Versailles were written in the blood of fallen heroes " (Lloyd George) Comment

7 "The Treaty of Versailles inflicted upon Germany too much insult and too little injury " Discuss

8 "Peace settlement of 1919 contained the seeds of its destruction " Discuss

9 "A great opportunity for lasting peace was missed in 1919 " In the light of this statement discuss the chief defects of the Treaty of Versailles

10 Discuss the part played by President Wilson towards the restoration of Peace in Europe in 1918

11 "At the Peace Conference of Paris, apart from the famous Treaty of Versailles, four other Treaties were also concluded" Examine the terms and significance of the Treaties

16
The League of Nations

A permanent general international organization of a universal character came into existence or the first time after World War I. This development marked another stage in the history of international organization. It owned much to the experience and experiments, including the many abortive plans and projects, of the past. "Modern international organization," stated Mangone, "with its wide array of institutions, evolved from the conferences of the preceding centuries." In the new world of the twentieth century the older techniques were not adequate, but they did provide the foundations upon which the present complex structure of international organization has been built.

STAGES IN THE CREATION OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

1. The Concert of Europe. The idea of having an international organisation to maintain peace and promote prosperity is a very old one. The Amphictyonic League of Greek cities provides the earliest example of the international organisation. Many statesmen since early times have placed proposals for forming of world organisation. However, these proposals did not materialise till the First World War. No institution springs suddenly into full-blown existence. The League of Nations was no exception. Violence is as old as mankind. War is so old as political association. Likewise reaction against war and plans for preventing it have a long history. The nature of the international institutions created by the covenant was considerably determined by pre-war movements. The concert of Europe was the first of these pre-war movements. It had emerged as a result of a long and continuous development of international organization in the past. It served as a model for the Council of the League.

2. Hague Conference. Another element that went into the formation of the league of Nations was the movement for limitation of armaments and systematization of arbitration. It culminated in the Hague Conference of 1899 and 1907. These Conferences served as a model for the assembly of the League, which would take over and develop further the 'legislative' functions initiated by the Hague conferences.

3. Public International Unions. Another element was the development and successful functioning of a number of public international unions. While some of these organisations were set up to deal with an administrative

problem, such as the Universal Postal Unions, other had considerable power to deal with local situation such as Rhine Commission and European Danube Commission Thus ample precedents for League of Nations may be found in preceding international institutions

4 **Proposals for Peace** The idea of the League of Nations had been in gestation long before it took concrete shape at Versailles in 1919 Professor Rappard of Switzerland set up a committee to study the bases of lasting world peace after the outbreak of World War I A group of persons under the leadership of Lord Bryce made specific proposals for world peace in Great Britain The League of Nations Society of England (i) League of Nations should be established by treaty (ii) Disputes between member states should be settled by arbitration or by a council of conciliation (iii) Periodic conferences should be held to codify international law An important organisation called "The League to Enforce Peace" was formed in the U S A in January, 1915 under the leadership of ex-President Taft, to advance peace proposals Sweden, Denmark and Norway also published peace plans Lloyd George, the British Prime Minister made a very significant policy speech, at Stockholm in 1919 On January 5, 1919 he said, 'we must seek by the creation of some international organization to limit the burden of armament and diminish the probability of war"

5 **Phillimore Committee** Shortly after he assumed office as a minister in the coalition Government in 1916 Lord Robert Cecil circulated a minute in the foreign office He suggested that an inter departmental committee should be appointed to prepare the draft of an agreement between nations for the maintenance of peace through mutual cooperation He wanted to put into effect the proposal of Sir Edward Grey to establish some sort of an international society of nations to guard against any future catastrophe of war This proposal was approved A committee was set up under the relationship of Lord Phillimore The Phillimore Committee did not make arbitration compulsory nor did it propose the establishment of a permanent organization As envisaged by the Phillimore Committee The League was not to be world wide but limited to the Allies in the beginning The committee had no suggestion about disarmament nor about the wider interests of a world organization

6 **French Committee** The French Government appointed a Committee under the Chairmanship of Ex-Prime Minister Leon Bourgeois to study the project of a League The report of the Committee was more definite than that of the Phillimore Committee According to it an international tribunal was to be empowered to settle the disputes and to see that the decision were fully carried out A detailed list of diplomatic, legal and economic sanctions was also prepared

7 **Fourteen Points** On January 8, 1918, President Wilson made a speech in which he enunciated his famous "fourteen points" as a "programme of

World's Peace". The concluding portion of these points read as follows: "A general association of Nations must be formed under specific covenants for the purpose of affording mutual guarantees of political independence and territorial integrity to great and small states alike." Wilson studied the Phillimore and French Report and then put forward his own draft. It provided for meetings of representatives of Powers, permanent Secretariat, guarantees of territory, disarmament, compulsory arbitration and organization of military forces of the states against any member who went to war.

8. Cecil Draft. Towards the end of 1918 "Cecil Draft" came into existence in England.

9. Smut's Scheme. In December 1918, General Smuts published a pamphlet on the League which paid great attention to the "mandate" system. His scheme consisted of the details of structure and machinery. He pointed out that plans were vague on this particular point. He proposed a general conference of all members, a council and an Arbitration Court.

10. Hirst Miller Drafts. This was followed by Wilson's second and third drafts and the official British draft. The agreed Anglo-American views were embodied in a single draft known as "Hirst Miller Draft". This was presented to the League of Nations Commission of the Peace Conference.

11. The Covenant. The covenant was a well drafted document, mainly because it was drawn up by men of exception ability. The commission responsible for the task of drafting of the covenant had in the beginning only 10 members, two representatives from each of the Five Great Powers. Later after protest from the small states, it was enlarged by nine additional members. President Wilson served as Chairman.

As Part I of the Treaty of Versailles, the Covenant was signed on June 28, 1919-1920. After the required number of ratifications were obtained, it went into effect on January 10, 1920. Thus the League of Nations came into existence on January 10, 1920.

SOURCES OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

1. Private and Public Schemes. The immediate sources of the League of Nations are to be found in the development of both private and public schemes during the war e.g., League to Enforce Peace in U.S.A., the League of Nations Society in U.K., Cecil's draft, Phillimore's draft, Wilson's Project of Fourteen Points, Colonel's House's Pamphlet, J.C.Smuts' Plan etc.

2. Special Committee. The actual formulation of the covenant of the League of Nations was the work of a special Committee established by the Paris Peace Conference which began its sessions in January 1919.

3. Hirst-Miller Draft. A combination of British and American Plans The Hirst-Miller Draft was used as the basic working paper.

4. Fathers of the League. Wilson Cecil and Smuts earned the title of "Fathers of the League"

5 The Covenant. Presented to the plenary conference on April 28,1919, Covenant became an integral part of the Treaty of Versailles, and assumed formal effectiveness on January 10, 1920

6 Concert of Europe The Council of the League of Nations was a new edition of the Concert of Europe

7. Structure. The Assembly of the League represented the realization of the hopes and plans of the Hague statesmen for a general conference of the Nations The Secretariat was an institutional flowering of the seminal concept of the international bureau which had been found in the earlier unions The permanent Court of International Justice which was anticipated in Article 14 of the covenant constituted the full-fledged international judicial organ which the Hague conferences had vainly tried to create

8 Composite of 19th century International Documents The creation of the League may also be regarded as a rationalization, localization, and consolidation of previous organization developments The League was a composite of the institutional documents of the 19th century agencies, it pulled together the separate lines of development into a coherent system

9. 19th Century beginning. The League was also the product of nineteenth century beginning in the sense that it picked up the ideas, adopted the assumption and reached to the awareness which had been emergent in earlier period

10. Product of First World War. In important respects the League was the product of the First World War It was a response to realization of the vital need to prevent Wars

11. Prevention of Accidental Wars The League was based on reaction against the blind hostilities in 1914 "The concept of the accidental war underlay the system of prudent precautions which was outlined in the covenant providing guarantee, that people and government should have and utilize opportunities for cooling off, facing facts and reaching decent settlements in any future crisis The League was established to prevent the accidental war"

12. War-Time Cooperation. The experience of war-time cooperation among the members of the victorious coalition inspired peoples to meet the moral challenge of proving that they cooperated readily to promote the values of peace and avoid the catastrophe of war as they done to bring the war successful conclusion

13 Legitimation of Settlements In 1919, the triumphant Allies desired to invest the fruits of victory, to keep the spoils which they had gained,

to establish and uphold a new *status quo* reflecting the shift in power relations which military events had proclaimed, and to maintain their coalition to keep Germany in a posture of defeat. The function envisaged for the League was to keep a "Special peace" to legitimize and stabilize a particular world settlement based upon victory. The major allies asserted the right to make the settlement and assumed the responsibility to dominate the future course of events, since the small states hardly had any determining voice at Paris.

14. Ideological Climate. Lastly, the League was product of the ideological climate of the time. Its source included not only the heritage of past institutional inventions and the political realities of the present, but also the aspirations for the future, derived from a combination of facts and ideas, circumstances and purposes, objective conditions and subjective conception.

NATURE OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

1. Sovereign Members. The League of Nations was not in any sense a world State and Super State federation exercising independent power over its component states which remained intact, as is the rule of unanimity on all major issues. The judgment of the member states was jealously guarded in the covenant of the League. Vital decisions required unanimity among all members.

2. Independent Armed Power. The interpretations of the obligations, the decision as to action or inaction rested with the component states, which action if this should at any time be seen more in accordance with their interests as in the case of Japan and Germany. The decisive bases of armed power rested with the separate state and not with the League.

3. Mandate System. The League of Nations was in fact a grouping of victor imperialist powers and of secondary states. The colonial peoples were "represented" only by their master. Soviet Russia, no less than defeated Germany, Australia, Hungary and Turkey, were excluded from invitation. The mandate system was a transparent cover for the division of the colonial spoils of the defeated Germany. A proposal by Japan to include in the covenant a clause recognizing "the principle of equality of nations and just treatment of their nationals" and guaranteeing "no distinction on account of race and nationality", though supported by a majority, was defeated by British and American opposition. Lord Cecil objected that such a suggestion "raised extremely serious problems for the British empire". President Wilson protested that it would raise the race issue throughout the world. Soviet Russia regarded the original conception of the League of Nations with suspicion as "a Coalition of certain states endeavouring to usurp power over other states" and "a pseudo-international body", which really serves as a mere mask to conceal from the

masses the aggressive designs of their vassals The founders of the League approved the basic principles of the traditional Multi-State System They accepted the independent sovereign state as the basic entity, the great powers as the predominant participants, and Europe as the central core of the world political system The League was the manifestation of reform movement, an effort to improve the producers and assist the operation of the world political system A conspicuous effort had been made to create a systematic relation for the first time As designed at the Paris Preace Conference, the League combined new with old It was intended to introduce radical changes in the operation of the multi-state system

STRUCTURE OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

The League of Nations was the direct outcome of the horrors of World War I It was established to ward-off the recurrence of war and to ensure peace and security in the war-weary world

Membership

There were two types of members of the League of Nations—the original and non-original The original members of the League of Nations were those states and dominions who were the signatories to the Treaty of Peace or those states who were invited to accede to the Covenant and actually acceded before March 20,1920 About the non-original members, the Covenant provided in Article 1(2) that "any fully self-governing state, dominion or colony not named in the annexure may become a member of the League if its admission is agreed to by two-thirds of the Assembly, provided that it shell give effective guarantees of its sincere intention to observe its international obligations, and shall accept such regulations as may be prescribed by the League in regard to its military, naval and air forces and armaments" There were 42 original members of the League of Nations Seventeen states were subsequently admitted as members Certain states were refused membership on numerous grounds

League membership of a state could be terminated by voluntary withdrawal, by expulsion and by the lapse consequent upon dissent from amendments under Article 26 Article 1(3) provided that "any member of League may, after two years' notice of its intention so to do, withdraw from the League, provided that all its international obligations and all its obligations under the Covenant shall have been fulfilled at the time of its withdrawal" During the life-time of the League 16 states withdrew from its membership U S S R was the only country to be expelled from the membership of the League for violating Article 16 of the Covenant when she committed aggression on Finland in December, 1939 Though 62 states were members of the League of Nations, its total strength never exceeded 58

ORGANIZATION OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

The League of Nations had three main organs—the Assembly, the Council and the Secretariat. In addition to these three were two other organisations, viz., the Permanent Court of International Justice and the International Labour Organisation.

1. The Assembly. Every member of the League of Nations automatically became a member of the Assembly. Although each state was permitted to send three representatives to the Assembly, it had only one vote. The Assembly closely resembled a diplomatic conference. It was not an international legislative body. All important decisions could be taken by the Assembly by the unanimous agreement of the members present at the meeting. The Assembly could be convened as and when necessary. The Assembly elected its own President at every new session by a majority of votes. Usually the President was taken from some small state not at that time represented on the council.

2. Functions of the Assembly. The Covenant had not drawn a clear line of demarcation between the functions of the Assembly and the Council. The powers of the two organs were defined in identical language, viz., each had the power to "deal at its meeting with any matter within the sphere of action of the League of affecting the peace of the World" [Articles 3(3) and 4(5)]. However, the Covenant also conferred on both the bodies a number of special or exclusive functions. The exclusive functions assigned to the Assembly included:

(i) the right to admit new members to the League of Nations by a two-third majority;

(ii) election of the non-permanent members of the Council;

(iii) apportioning the expenses of the League among the member states;

(iv) advising reconsideration by members of the League, of the treaties which had become inapplicable;

(v) considerations of international conditions whose continuance might endanger the peace of the world;

(vi) supervising the work of the Council;

(vii) election of fifteen judges of the Permanent Court of International Justice every nine years by majority vote;

(viii) amendment of the Covenant ; and

(ix) approval of the nomination of the Secretary General by the Council.

2. Council. The Council was designed to be a small body to serve as the executive organ of the League. It consisted of five permanent members (the U.S.A., the British Empire, France, Italy, and Japan) and four

non permanent members, mostly lesser power Due to failure of the United States of America to join the League, the membership of the Council stayed at eight until two non-permanent seats were added in 1922 The Council could increase the number of permanent and non-permanent members with the approval of the majority of the Assembly [Art 4(2)] It was in pursuance of this power that Germany was given a permanent seat in 1926 and U S S R was made a member in 1934 The number of the non-permanent members was also eventually increased to eleven

The Council was expected to meet at least once a year It met either at the seat of the League or at such other place as was decided upon Emergency meetings of the Council could be summoned during the emergency arising out of war or threat of a war Every member of the Council had only one vote When a state was not represented on the Council and a matter pertaining to that state came up for consideration, a special invitation was to be extended to the state concerned

Functions of the Council

The Council could deal with all the, matters within the sphere of the League or affecting the peace of the world In addition, the Council was *specifically entrusted with the following functions*

(i) Nomination of additional permanent member of the Council, (ii) formulating plans for the reduction of armaments, taking into account geographical situation and circumstances of each state, (iii) to advise c ' the evil effects of manufacture of munitions and implements of war by private enterprise can be prevented However, due regard had to be given to the necessities of those members of the League which were not able to manufacture the munitions and implements of war necessary for their safety, (iv) to advise upon the means which the members of the League were to preserve, as against external aggression, the territorial integrity and existing political independence of their fellow members, (v) to define the scope of authority or control to be exercised by the Mandatory power under the Mandate System, (vi) to direct the work of the Secretariat and receive reports from their subsidiary organs of the League, (vii) to recommend to the several government effective military sanctions and expulsion of any member who had violated any of the covenants of the League The Council also prepared plans for disarmament and nominated the Secretary-General, subject to the approval of the Assembly

3. The Secretariat. The Covenant provided for a permanent Secretariat, headed by the Secretary General, at Geneva It was to consist of such secretaries and staff as may be required The Secretary-General was appointed by the Council with the approval of the Assembly The Secretary and other staff of the Secretariat was appointed by the Secretary-General with

the approval of the Council. The expenses for the maintenance of the Secretariat were contributed by the member states in proportion decided by the Assembly. Unlike the Assembly and the Council, which held periodical meetings the Secretariat worked throughout the year, while on duty the officials of the League were entitled to diplomatic privileges and immunities. The members of the League were in no way responsible to their respective governments.

Functions of the Secretariat

The chief functions of the Secretariat included:

(i) co-ordinating the widespread activities of the League carried on by its various organs;

(ii) providing a source of continuity and follow-up for League work;

(iii) keeping the records of the League's agencies;

(iv) furnishing information and analysis to organs and delegates;

(v) registration of treaties and international engagements entered into by the members of the League;

(vi) arrangement of the meetings and the like;

(vii) indirectly influencing in a limited manner the settlement of disputes and formulation of League policy.

4. The Permanent Court of International Justice. Article 14 of the Covenant had entrusted to the Council the responsibility of formulating and submitting to the member plans for the establishment of a Permanent Court of International Justice. Accordingly in 1920, the Council appointed a Commission of jurists. The Commission prepared a statute of the proposed Court, which was submitted for approval to the Council, Assembly and the members of the League. After the statute was ratified by the member states, a Court was set up at the Hague. By 1939, fifty-one states had become the members of the Court.

Composition

Originally the International Court of Justice consisted of 11 judges and 4 deputy judges. The strength of the judges was increased to 15 through an amendment in 1930. In 1936 the offices of deputy judges were abolished. These judges were elected for a term of 9 years by the Council and the Assembly. The candidates were nominated by the national groups of the Hague Permanent Court of Arbitration, each group having the right to name 4 candidates, only 2 of whom were to be of its own nationality. The Secretary-General of the League prepared a list of the persons so nominated and transmitted it to the Council and the Assembly. These two bodies concurrently elected the judges.

Jurisdiction of the Court

The Court gave its judgments on questions involving the interpretation of International law, treaties and other mutual obligations. However, it had

jurisdiction only over such disputes as members were willing to submit to it A few countries, agreed in advance to submit all their disputes to the court for settlement Others reserved the right to submit only those cases to the court which they like In the words of Schuman, the establishment of the Permanent Court of International justice was "the most important and successful effort thus far made to establish as international judicial tribunal for the adjudication of controversies between states" During its existence the Court tried sixty-five cases and handed down thirty-two judgments, twenty-seven advisory opinions and several hundred orders thus it created a body of legal precedents of great utility for the solution of future international cases of justiciable character

5. **International Labour Organisation.** This was set up as a part of the organisation of the League and an integral part of League All members of the League also became its members Its main objective was to promote *international peace through the promotion of social justice by regulating working* hours, labour supply, prevention of unemployment, providing adequate living wages, protection of workers against sickness, disease, injury, etc , protection of children and women vocational and technical education, freedom of association and technical assistance to under development countries In short, the chief objective of the I L O was "to gain recognition for workers as human social beings rather than as mere commodities to be bought cheaply and to be exploited in the process of industrial and agricultural production "

I L O worked under the control of a Governing Body consisting of 32 per While 16 of these members represented the Governments, 8 represented the employers and 8 represented workers The term of the governing body was fixed at three years

I L O provided an international forum for the discussion of labour legislation It prepared the ways for the formulation of international standards of labour legislation It worked as a useful agency for the collection and publication of labour statistics It continued to work even during and Second World War In December 1964 it became a specialised agency of the U N

FUNCTIONS OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

The main functions of the League of National have been specified in the preamble to the Covenant, which reads "The high contracting parties, in order to promote international co-operation and to achieve international peace and security by the acceptance of obligations not to resort to war by the prescription of open just and honourable relations between nations by the firm establishment of the understandings of international law as the actual rule of conduct among governments and, by the maintenance of justice and a scrupulous respect for all treaty obligations in the dealings of the organized people with one another, agree to this Covenant of the League of Nations "

In pursuance of the objectives laid down in the preamble the following were the functions of League of Nations:

1. Disarmament. The League had to Formulate plans for "the reduction of national armaments to the lowest point consistent with national safety" (Art.8).

2. Protection. The league had to 'undertake to respect and preserve as against external aggression the territorial integrity and existing political independence of all members of the League'. In case of any such aggression, the Council was expected to advise the means by which this obligation was to be fulfilled (Art. 10). The Senate of U.S.A. refused to ratify the treaty of Versailles mainly on the grounds of Article 10. Consequently U.S.A. could not become a member of the League of Nations.

3. Settlement of international disputes. Under Article 12 the members were obliged to submit their disputes, likely to cause rupture either to arbitration or judicial settlement or to the inquiry by the Council. They had not to resort to war until three months after the awards by the arbitrations or the judicial decision or the report by the Council. The members were expected to comply with the award or decision, the council could propose the necessary steps to give affect to the same. [Art. 13(4)] If a state resorted to war in violation of the convenant it was *ipso facto* considered to have committed an act of war against all other members of the League, which were expected to severe all trade and financial relations and prevent all financial, commercial or personal intercourse between the nationals of the covenant breaking state and the nationals of any other state. The council could also demand from several Governments concerned necessary contribution of armed forces. In extreme cases members violating the Covenant of the League could be expelled from the membership of the League (Art. 16). Russia was actually expelled from the membership of the League in 1940 following her invasion of Finland.

4. Peaceful Changes. The League of the Nations was expected to take steps to bring about peaceful changes. For the purpose, the Assembly could from time to time advise the reconsideration by members of the League of the treaties which had become inapplicable, and the consideration of international conditions whose continuance could endanger the peace of the world (Art. 13).

5. Supervision. The League was also expected to exercise supervision over the mandate territories.

6. Human Welfare. The League was expected to take the necessary steps for the promotion of human welfare.

7. International Understanding. Thus, the League helped to make the people aware of the existence of world conditions and world problems and to dispel ideas concerning purely national and isolated difficulties.

ACHIEVEMENTS OF LEAGUE OF NATIONS

1. Political Achievements One of the chief objectives for the creation of the League was 'to promote international co-operation and achieve international peace and security During its existence the League was called upon to examine about 40 political disputes between different states Most of these disputes ware handled by the Council Some of them were also referred to Assembly or the Permanent Court of International Justice Some of these disputes were of serious nature which could threaten the peace of the world, while other disputes were of minor importance The League was able to asset its authority effectively against small nations The big and strong powers, however, did not submit to its authority on the plea that it infringed their sovereign rights

(A) Solution of Disputes

Following were the main disputes handled in the League

(i) Island Dispute Island dispute was one of the first disputes brought to the attention of the League Council This island lay between Sweden and Finland both of which once belonged to Sweden These were acquired by Russia in 1809 During the Russian Revolution of 1918 Finland declared her independence which was recognised by Sweden The residents of the Island who were mainly Swedish, began to agitate for union with Sweden Though the Swedish government remained indifferent, the people of Sweden wanted r government to help the islands Great Britain, exercising her rights ' , Convenant, brought the case to the attention of the Secretary-General The matter was referred to a committee of Jurists, which decided that the dispute was not a matter of domestic jurisdiction as claimed by Finland The Council gave its decision in June 1921 by which Finland's sovereignty over the island was recognised The residents of the islands were to be guaranteed autonomy and protection of political rights Use of Swedish in schools was *to be preserved The archipelago was to be neutralized and unfortified In April,* 1922 an international convention guaranteed the neutrality of the islands and gave them the requisite international protection

(ii) Dispute of Eupen and Malmedy In 1920-21 Germany protested to the Council against the attribution of Eupen and Malmedy to Belgium In September 1920, the council decided to recognise the transfer of the districts of Eupen and Malmedy to Belgium as final On February 22,1922 Germany was informed by the Secretary-General that the decision was final

(iii) Mosul Boundary Dispute As per terms of the Treaty of Lausanne (1923) a mutually acceptable boundary line was to be drawn between Turkey and Iraq As both the parties failed to draw a mutually acceptable boundary line and claimed Mosul Vilayet, an area rich in oil, the matter was referred to the League in 1924 An emergency session of the League Council was

called at Brussels. It drew a provisional boundary line pending final judgment. Ultimately, the same line was made a permanent line between Turkey and Iraq. Though Great Britain and Iraq accepted the award, Turkey refused to do so. By a compromise treaty concluded between Turkey and Great Britain in 1926, a small part to the Vilayet was given to Turkey along with some royalties from the Mosul oil fields.

(iv) Greeco-Italian Dispute or The Corfu Incident. In August 1923, certain military officers were murdered on Greek soil. The Italian government demanded apologies and full reparations for the crime from the Greek government. As the latter failed to comply with the demands of Italy, she occupied the island of Corfu. In September, 1923 the Greek Government referred the matter to the League Council. The League Council notified that communication had been received from the Conference of Ambassadors informing about the settlement of the dispute by diplomatic negotiations.

(v) The Greeco-Bulgarian Crisis. In October, 1925 a border incident led to flagrant invasion of Bulgarian territory by Greek forces. To repair the breach of Covenant obligations, the Bulgarian government requested an immediate meeting of the Council of the League. The Acting President of the Council ordered that until the Council had heard both the sides, all troops must be withdrawn to their respective frontiers. The belligerents acceded to the demand. Military attaches of Great Britain, France and Italy went to the scene of action to verify the position. Calm was restored on both the sides within nine days of the aggression.

(vi) War in Gran Chaco. In 1928 trouble started in Gran Chaco, situated between Bolivia and Paraguay. As soon as the matter came to the notice of the Council, it sent a telegram to both the parties, urging both the parties to reach an amicable settlement. As a result the immediate quarrel was resolved. However, fresh troubles started in 1932 which could not be checked by the efforts of the neighbouring states. Impelled by the circumstances the League sent a Commission of Inquiry. The war between the two states ended in 1936 by the exhaustion of both the belligerents rather than by the concerted efforts of the Inquiry Commission. However, the incident certainly demonstrated the interest which the League was taking in the preservation of peace everywhere.

(vii) Manchurian Dispute. In 1931 a serious dispute arose between Japan and China over Manchuria. In September 1931 Japan occupied Central Manchuria on the plea that China had destroyed her railway properties. China appealed to the League Council which called upon the disputants to withdraw their troops. As the Japanese failed to withdraw their troops, the Council appointed a five-men Commission to study the situation. In the meanwhile Japan attacked Shanghai and China once again appealed to the Assembly, which adopted a resolution on March 4, 1932 calling on Japan to evacuate Shanghai. Tokyo did quit Shanghai under the Armistice of May 5, 1932 but she continued to

hold on to Manchuria The League could not do anything except that some of the powers of the League refused to recognise Manchukuo

(viii) Italian Attack on Ethiopia In October, 1935 Italy attacked Ethiopia Ethiopia asked the League to take action under Article 16 of the Covenant The League Council appointed a 'Committee of six' which reported that the Italian Government had resorted to war in utter disregard of its obligations under Article 2 On October 9, 1935, the Assembly adopted the report and decided to apply economic sanctions against Italy The appeal for economic sanction met with very favourable response and by November 18, 1945 the economic siege of Italy was completely enforced But Italy did not bother about the resolutions of the League and continued bombing Addis Ababa fell to the invaders and the whole country lay at the mercy of Mussolini On May 5, 1936 Italy declared that the war is over and Abyssinia is Italian Thus the League sanctions failed to stop the invading Italian armies By July 1936 the measures taken in execution of Article 16 were withdrawn and Ethiopia was left to her fate

(ix) German Aggression Germany posed the most serious challenge to the League On October 14,1933 she withdrew from the League On March 16, 1935 she ordered conscription in violation of the Treaty of Versailles On March 7, 1936 the Rhineland was remilitarized in violation of the Locarno Treaties In March 1938 Austria was occupied In March 1939 Czechoslovakia was invaded and seized The League took no effective action against Germany for all these violations excepts adopting resolutions and giving warnings In September, 1939 Germany invaded Poland and the World War II started By this time the League had become almost defunct

(x) Other Disputes In addition to the above cases the League also handled the case of city of Vilna between Poland and Lituania (1920-22), the case of Hungarian optants between Hungary and Rumania (1923-30), dispute over nationality decrees between Great Britain and France (1921), dispute over Faworzina District between Poland and Czechoslovakia (1923-24), Demir Kapur case between Bulgaira and Greece (1925-26), Austro-German Customs Union case between Great Britain, France and Austria in 1931 During the years 1924 to 1930 Germany was also included as a member in the League Members attached great importance to the activities of the League as is evident from the fact that prior to 1924 the member states were not represented at Geneva by their Foreign Ministers In 1924 when MacDonald and Herriot came to Geneva for the Assembly of 1924, they set a precedent of far-reaching importance Soon the foreign ministers of most other European powers also started attending nearly every session of the Council and Assembly In course of time Geneva came to be recognized as the meeting place for the statesmen of Europe This increased the strength of League and she was able to settle almost all the cases referred to her during this period

(B) Other Political Activities

(i) Mandates Commission. The Mandate Commission, a body composed of eleven experts in colonial government, received annual reports from the Mandatory Powers on the territories administered by them. The Commission submitted these reports to the Council with its comments and recommendations. The Council considered these reports and made necessary recommendations to the Mandatory Powers.

(ii) Problem of Minorities. The League also looked after the problem of the minorities. It appointed a Committee of three members of the Council for this purpose. The Committee would receive complaint from the minorities and discussed the matter with the Government of the concerned state. It generally succeeded in obtaining an undertaking from the government to remedy the grievance complained of. However, if the committee failed to obtain satisfaction it could refer the petition to the Council. Thus, the League worked through the method of persuasion and consent.

(iii) Saar Commission. The League also successfully administered the Saar territory through a Governing Commission from 1920 to 1935, till a plebiscite was conducted there in January 1935. It also guaranteed the constitution of the free city of Danzig and appointed a High Commissioner to arbitrate on disputes between the Free City and Poland. However, both the parties were given the right to appeal to the council against the decision of the High Commissioner.

2. Economic Achievements

(i) Financial and Economic Committee. In the economic sphere the League provided for a new and elaborate machinery for international cooperation. It set up financial and economic committees composed of experts from various countries. These committees met annually at Geneva and directed the work of the financial and economic sections of the League. The Financial Committee of the League helped in tackling the problem of counterfeiting, falsification of commercial documents, double taxation and fluctuating value of gold. The Economic Committee did the preliminary work on a number of major international conferences, viz., the World Economic Conference of 1927 and the Monetary and Economic Conference of 1933.

(ii) Autonomous Communications and Transit Organisation. For the implementation of Article 23 of the Covenant "to make provision to secure and maintain freedom of communications and of transit and equitable treatment for the commerce of all members of the League," the League created an autonomous Communications and Transit Organisation. The organisation was concerned with the freedom of international transit, the collection of transit statistics, press facilities and accuracy of reporting, the simplification of passport and other travel documents, discrimination against foreign

shipping in ports, the use of inland waters, the uniformity of highway traffic regulation, coordination of the national public works programmes, etc

3 Social Achievements

(i) Elimination of Slavery In the social sphere also the League did a remarkable job In 1925, a Slavery convention was concluded at Geneva and in 1932, the League decided to set up a Permanent Slavery Commission

(ii) Improvement of Labour Conditions The League tried to improve the lot of the working people through the International Labour Organisation though the various conventions concluded by the I L O were generally not ratified by the member states

(iii) Improvement of Health In terms of Article 23 of the Covenant, the League set up in 1923 a Health Organisation with a Health Committee and Secretariat It closely collaborated with the governments in organising action against malaria, small pox, leprosy, rabies, cancer, tuberculosis syphilis, heart disease, etc With a view to improve the national health, the Health Organisation held technical conferences and helped researches in medicine The League co operated with China to organise relief work in flood areas The League did notable work in combating infant mortality, collecting statistics fixing dietary standards and controlling plagues

(iv) Resettlement Co operation The League also successfully solved the problem of the care and resettlement of millions of war prisoners and refugees Dr Nansen played an important role in the settlement of refugees under the aegis of the League The chief contribution of the League in this regard was mainly that of co-ordination with the help of funds provided by the states and private charitable institutions

(v) Intellectual Co-operation To assist the intellectuals in the war devastated areas the League appointed an International Committee on Intellectual Cooperation in 1922 In 1926, the International Institute of Intellectual Cooperation was set up at Paris to co ordinate "international collaboration with a view to promoting the progress of general civilisation and human knowledge and notably the development and diffusion of science, letters and arts" This was achieved through conferences lectures published materials to urge collective security, support of the League, elimination of inflammatory material from text books and radio broadcasts, etc

(vi) Reforms The League also did useful work in the field of control of traffic in dangerous drugs, promotion of child welfare, prison reform prohibition of traffic in women, suppression of trade in obscene publications, etc

Estimate of the League of Nations

1. Cordell Hull. "The League of Nations has been responsible for more humanitarian and scientific endeavour than any other organisation in history".

2. Walters. Establishment of the League was a 'revolutionary step'. It involved "changes of principles, changes even in the general conviction which form the basic of public opinion. Before the League it was held both in theory and practice that every state was the sole and sovereign judge of its own acts, owing no allegiance to any-higher authority, entitled to resent criticism or even questioning by other states". With the establishment of the League "the belief that aggressive war is a crime against humanity and that it is the interest, the right, and the duty of every state to join in preventing it is now everywhere taken for granted". Although the League as a working institution is dead, but the ideals which it sough to promote and the agencies it created have become an essential part of the political thinking of the civilised world.

3. Potter. "It measured by what other international organisations had accomplished in the past the League's performance even in the security field rates very high, indeed higher than that of any other international institution with the exception of a very few highly special and limited agencies."

From the above discussion it is evident that the League of Nations had much to its credit in the political, social, economic and educational fields.

CAUSES OF FAILURE OF LEAGUE

1. Incorporation of Covenant in the Peace Treaties. The Covenant of the League of Nations was made a part and parcel of the peace treaties. Hence it came to be regarded as an instrument of the victorious states to maintain *status quo.* It would have been better if the Covenant had been kept separate from these peace treaties. There were a number of states who were not satisfied with the peace treaties and were unwilling to ratify the same due to which they were automatically debarred from the membership of the League. For example, Germany looked at the Treaty of Versailles as a symbol of her national humiliation and was always in the look out to wreck it at the earlier opportunity.

2. Not Broad based. The League was not broad-based. A number of states like Russia, Germany, Austria and Turkey were not invited to join the League at the initial stages. It gave the feeling that the League was not a gathering of free nations but an assembly of the victorious imperialists and their satellite states, which had assembled to preserve the fruits of their victory and maintain the *status quo.* Even those major powers who joined the League of Nations were unwilling to co-operate. As a result of Senate's refusal to ratify the treaty of the Versailles U.S.A. which had played a dominant part in the birth of the League could not join it. Even England had accepted the obligations of the League Covenant in the hope that the U.S.A. with her vast resources, would be by her side in the new enterprise. Hence she was disheartened.

3 **Structural Defects.** There were inherent defects in the structure and constitution of the Covenant of the League These were as follows

(i) Permission to War. According to Prof Morgenthau a grave constitutional weakness of the League was that it permitted the states to resort to war under certain conditions Making distinction between the offensive and defensive war the Covenant had permitted the latter Making distinction between the offensive and defensive war the Covenant had permitted the latter The Covenant seemed to assume that war was the normal solution of international disputes

(ii) Unanimity unworkable The Covenant insisted that all decisions should be taken by a unanimous vote of the members of the Council except the parties to the dispute This rule proved unworkable and ultimately the Assembly moved towards the rule of simple majority

(iii) No Teeth. The League lacked teeth No international force was provided to enforce its decisions It could merely request the member states to act in a particular manner in a given situation Its request was not binding on them The Covenant did not make any provision for immediate action on the part of the League League did not intervene until a crucial stage had been reached By that time the major powers would commit themselves and it was not possible for them to recede without loss of prestige

4. **Lack of Cooperation by Powers** The failure of the League was due to the absence of the will on the part of the powers to work it In the absence of a spirit of co-operation even the best organisation is bound to fail A Potter has said, "The ultimate culprits in the failure of the League were the member states It was not the League of Nations but the Nations of the League which failed in so far as there was failure The legal obligation, or the legal theory of the organisation was defective on this side, but his did not preclude action by the members for effective promotion of security and welfare" Members of the League wanted to use the League for the furtherance of their own ends France was interested in security against Germany She supported Italy in Ethopia to win her over against Germany England viewed the League as "a valuable organ for the canalization and settlement of international disputes, for the promotion of economic recovery and social co-operation and for the preservation of an international balance" Even U S S R did not sincerely support the efforts of the League In 1940 she undertook aggression in Finland in violation of the Covenant of the League This led to her expulsion from the world body Likewise, Germany used the League to change some of the obnoxious features of the Treaty of Versailles She left the League because it clashed with her ideal of 'world hegemony'. Italy and Japan also had similar attitude towards the League

5. Lack of faith among Small Nations. As a result of the attitude of the major powers, the small nations lost faith in the capacity of the League to save them from any aggression. The principle of Collective Security was not applied in actual practice. Aggression would have been checked and the prestige of the League increased had all the states joined hands against Japan and Italy on the questions of Manchuria and Abyssinia respectively. As each state decided to follow its own policy and the League could not make any concerted effort the principle of collective security was weakened. This gave rise to a feeling in the minds of smaller nations that they could not depend much on the League.

6. Equal Status of Members. The equal status granted to all the members of the League irrespective of their size was not a proper basis of representation in the international organisation. As Anthony Eden pointed out, the idea of 'one nation', 'one vote' led to Liberia being treated as important as the Soviet Union and Costa Rica as important as the United Kingdom. This was not fair to big nations who had to bear the major responsibility.

7. Narrow Nationalism. In the words of Prof. Potter, "The League of Nations failed in so far as the people of Germany, Japan and Italy preferred to support their government in careers of imperialistic conquest and because the people of England, France and the United States discouraged their governments from taking effective action early enough to stem the tide of Axis aggression. The peoples and governments of totalitarian states were more responsible for the destruction of international collaboration under the League auspices than those of the liberal states, but the latter must bear a large share of negative blame."

8. Lack of Sanction. The League was not provided with any independent force to effectively deal with the states threatening the peace and security of the World. All the forces to be used against such states were under normal circumstances, left under the national government concerned. Only during the time of crisis these forces were put under international control. The states were free to contribute such forces to the international authority or refuse to do so. Though the League possessed an effective weapon in economic sanction but it was never applied effectively in actual practice. Economic sanctions were applied against Italy in a half-hearted manner and they failed to achieve the desired result. Even the member states were reluctant to apply the economic sanction because it hit their economy in turn.

9. Ahead of time formation. The League of Nations failed because it was formed ahead of its time. The people of the world were given to the habit of thinking in terms of national interest and not the interest of the world. The ideas of 'sovereignty' and 'freedom of action' were so deeply entrenched in their minds that it was impossible to replace them with the ideas of internationalism. Therefore they never felt it binding on them.

10 Unanimity rule Under the Covenant a decision in all matters other than procedural was to be taken by a unanimous vote of all the members However in actual practice due to power rivalries this unanimity of vote could not be achieved and the League could hardly take any action in the face of a crisis

11 Imbalance According to Prof Vendenbosh and Hogan The League of Nations rested upon three or four main pillars These were the provisions for the reduction of armaments (Art 8) the guarantees against aggression (Articles 10 and 16) the settlement of disputes (Article 12 to 15 and 17) and the provision for peaceful change (Art 19) The last two dovetailed into each other somewhat as the settlement of a dispute may involve a considerable revision of existing treaties Because these pillars were not of equal strength the League suffered from imbalance The drafters of the Convenant attempted to make the guarantees against aggression very strong while the provisions for reduction of armaments and for peaceful change were made relatively weak Not only was the provision for peaceful change weak but it seems to be tagged on as an after thought

Thus the League failed to preserve the security and peace of the world However its greatest achievement was that it did not die but merged with the U N As Lord Cecil put it The League is dead Long live the United Nations

QUESTIONS FOR EXERCISE

1 The League of Nations as designed at the Paris Peace Conference combined much that was new with much that was old —Comment

2 The League of Nations was not exclusively the product of the World War I but it come into existence out of several sources Elucidate

3 The League of Nations was not a State nor was it a Super State It was an organised association of Sovereign States created by Treaty a confederation world inside a scope (Gettell) Discuss

4 Write a short essay on the structure and functions of the League of Nations

5 The years between 1924 and 1930 were the period of League s greatest prestige and authority (Carr) Why does the author consider this as the best period during the existence of the League of Nations

6 Politically a failure the League of Nations had much to its credit in the social economic and educational field ' Discuss

7. Comment on the view that "the ultimate culprits in the failure of the League were the member states. It was not the League of Nations but the Nations of the League which failed in so far as there was a failure".

8. Why was the League of Nations called 'stillborn'? Account for its gradual decline and ultimate collapse.

17

Collective Security

In his annual report to the General Assembly in the fall of 1951, Secretary-General Trygve lie stated

I believe that the development of a strong and effective United Nations collective security system combined with renewed efforts at mediation and conciliation, can improve the chances of ameliorating and, in time, settling the great political conflicts that most endanger world peace today The greater the ability of the United Nations to foil attempts to solve conflicts of national interest by force, the more likely will it be that those conflicts can be settled by negotiation

Benjamin V Cohen, an American delegate to the General Assembly, said " My Government regards pacific settlement and collective measures as inseparable parts of collective security under the Charter If we succeed in building an effective security system, there will be less likelihood that an aggressor will risk the penalties bound to follow aggression The object of effective security is to relieve the world of the scourge of war and the fears of war Thus by building collective security we can release the constructive energies of the world for the constructive tasks of peace and human welfare We can open up new possibilities for pacific settlement and the processes of peaceful change "[1]

The UN is the most important agency for collective security and peaceful settlement that has ever been created It seeks to promote all possible means "to maintain international peace and security"

But, notwithstanding speeches in the United Nations, United States and other major powers of the Western World are relying more upon heavy expenditures and elaborate plans for national defense and for regional measures for "individual or collective self-defense" They are more concerned with security than with peaceful settlement They seem to attach more significance to individual and regional security than to collective security in its true and broader meaning

---

1 *Department of State Bulletin*, XXVI (January 21, 1952), 98-102

After the First World War while the French placed primary emphasis on security, the British emphasised peaceful settlement. As the international atmosphere darkened in the late twenties and early thirties concern for security pushed subordinate questions more and more into the background. In the United Nations security considerations seem to be dominant, whatever the Charter may say.

Collective Security

According to Iris L.Claude "Since World War II the concept of collective security has been persistently advocated and attacked, defended and criticized; it has figured prominently in the theoretical or critical and ideological debate concerning the management of international relations. Moreover, there has been recurrent movement towards and away from translation of the collective security principle into a working system."[2]

Definition of Collective Security

1. Charles B. Marshall. Collective Security is a "generalized notion of all nations banding together in undertaking a vague obligation to perform unspecified actions in response to hypothetical events brought on by some unidentifiable state."[3]

2. Georg Schwarzenberger. Collective Security is a "machinery for joint action in order to prevent or counter any attack against an established international order."[4] Ernest A. Gross, United States Deputy Representative to the United Nations, declared: "There is no alternative to collective action for the achievement of security. The opposite of collective security is complete insecurity."[5]

COLLECTIVE SECURITY AND COLLECTIVE ACTION

1. Collective action and collective security. Collective action is not collective security. It is limited by the vague and general nature of the commitments and by the unwillingness of the states concerned to take sufficiently vigorous action to deal with major emergencies. Some collective action may be better described as pointed towards non-collective insecurity.

---

2. Iris L. Claude, Jr., *Power and International Relations* (New York : Random House, 1962), p. 150.
3. In Ernest W. Lefever, ed., *Ethics and United States Foreign Policy* (Cleveland: Meridian Books, 1957), pp. 38-39.
4. Address at the University of Virginia, July 13, 1951; printed in the *Department of State Bulletin*, XXV (July 30, 1951).
5. Georg Schwarzenberger, *Power Politics* (New York : Frederick A. Praeger, 1951), p. 494.

2 While collective action may mean the limited collaboration of a few states on an *ad hoc* basis collective security implies far reaching commitments and obligations on the part of the majority of the states of the world including all or at least most of the great powers As Quincy Wright explained The relations of the balance of power to collective security have been at the same time complementary and antagonistic" Professor Wright asserted that the principles of collective security are not antithetic but supplementary to those of the balance of power International organization to promote collective security is only a planned development of the natural tendency of balance of power policies" However on the other hand that the fundamental assumptions of the two systems are different [6]

1 Collective security and a balance of power policy are incompatible because the object of the one is to align all other states against an offending or war making state whereas the other contemplates the maintenance of such an equilibrium of power that no state will dare undertake a resort to arms

2 The substance of the first is a united world front against a possible aggressor the substance of the second is two approximately equal and opposing fronts

3 Collective security implies a far greater degree of systematization than does balance of power Balance of power is a system only by courtesy while the accusation that it amounts to anarchy is too strong it is assuredly a most unsystematic system Collective security on the other hand represents the urge for systematization the institutionalization of international relations [7]

Requirements of Collective Security

1 A collective security system must be strong enough to cope with aggression from any power or combination of powers and it must be invoked if and as aggression occurs

2 The principle of collective security requires that states identify their national interest so completely with the preservation of the total world order that they stand ready to join the collective action to put down any aggressive threat by any state against any other state anywhere [8] It involves a willingness to apply sanctions as and when necessary and even to go to war As Stanley Baldwin declared in April 1939 Collective

---

6 *Constitutionalism and World Politics* University of Illinois Bulletin Vol 49 No 32 (December 1951) p 10

7 Claude pp 147 148

8 *Ibid.* p 146

security will never work unless all the nations that take a part in it are prepared simultaneously to threaten with sanctions and to fight, if necessary, an aggressor."

3. Collective security must be far more than an alliance. "The typical instrument of advance commitment in the balance system is an alliance, which collectively envisages a broader arrangement, usually involving obligations of common action undertaken in the constitution document of a general international organization."[9] It calls "upon nations to go beyond aligning themselves with each other to meet the threats emanating from common national enemies and to embrace instead a policy of defence directed against aggression in general or, more precisely, against any aggression anywhere."[10] It must be open to those states which are willing to accept its obligations in good faith. It must not be directed against any specific power or combination of powers. The decisive tests would seem to be whether the system is strong enough, whether the states associated in it abide by the obligations to the fullest extent necessary in times of crises, and whether the great powers adhere to it.

4. Collective security involves acceptance of the view that the national interests of the participating states can best by defended by collective action, even at the cost of limitations on the freedom of decision of the individual states. As Professor Friedmann explains: A successful system of collective security does not necessarily presuppose a complete abandonment of national independence or individuality. It does, however, require the submission of individual national will to collective decisions ... and in order to be effective it requires the international control of military forces and vital weapons, which is certainly not possible without a severe restriction of national sovereignty.[11]

This is asking for a more binding commitment than the states of the world are willing.

5. "In any event," as Professor Claude has pointed out, "the doctrine of collective security requires a more thoroughgoing renunciation of the free hand in foreign policy, a more nearly complete acceptance of advance commitment to participate in sanctions against any aggressor, on behalf of any victim, under any circumstances.[12]

---

9. *Ibid*, p. 128.
10. Arnold Wolfers, "Collective Security and the War in Korea," *Yale Review*, XLIII (June, 1954), 482.
11. W. Friedmann, *An Introduction to World Politics* (Toronto, 1951), p. 57.
12. *Ibid.*, p. 239.

Collective Security and Regional Arrangements

Regional arrangements for collective defense and for other purposes seldom establish a collective security system Such arrangements are geographically too limited They are not sufficiently binding in character They do not represent such an aggregation of military strength that they can deal with any other power or combination of powers Among regional arrangements past or present NATO may possibly be such an aggregation of strength, but even it will not provide real collective security unless its members voluntarily assume more binding obligations than they were willing to accept

Regional arrangements, could conceivably be an important part of a broader collective security system However, the exact relationship between regional arrangements and the United Nations has never been clarified They are supplementary to the UN system and do not supersede it. But the final wording of a UN resolution of January 12, 1952, suggested that many of the member states of the UN viewed their obligations to regional arrangements as superior to those of the Charter

Collective Security and Disarmament

Collective security and disarmament have been regarded as separate approaches to the problem of war and peace It has not yet appeared feasible to link the two in an interdependent way in a practicable measure for maintaining peace However, a forceful statement of their relationship was made in January, 1952, by Benjamin V Cohen of the United States delegation to the General Assembly

> I should like to stress the fact that there is an intimate relationship between a programme of collective security and a programme of *disarmament The two, by their nature, go hand in hand In the* disarmament field, we look to the day when no nation will have armed forces or armaments which could pose a threat to a neighbour In the collective-security field, we look to the day when nations will not rely so much on their own forces as on the United Nations for their security If states are assured that in case of attack they will not stand alone, they will need fewer arms for their defense As progress is made in disarmament, the task of building collective security becomes simpler The two march together Disarmament and collective security are the two great enterprises for peace that this General Assembly has before it [13]

---

13 *Department of State Bulletin*, XXVI (January 21, 1952), 101-102

COLLECTIVE SECURITY UNDER THE LEAGUE

The doctrine of collective security was given legal basis by the Covenant of the League, which imposed an obligation on the members to refrain from action which threatened international peace and security, as well as to accept the competence of international authority to take concerted counter measures. The Covenant accorded a legal basis to the principle of 'collective security' by incorporating a number of provisions relating to it. Article 10 to the Covenant laid down "The members of the League undertake to respect and preserve as against external aggression the territorial integrity and existing political independence of all Members of the League. In case of any such aggression or in case of any threat or danger of such aggression the Council shall advise upon the means by which this obligations shall be fulfilled."

About the procedure of the settlement of disputes the following was laid down :

1. **Article 11.** (1) Any war or threat of war, whether immediately affecting any of the member of the League or not is hereby declared a matter of concern to the whole League and the League shall take any action that may be deemed wise and effectual to safeguard the peace of nations. In case any such emergency should arise the Secretary-General shall on the request of any member of the League forthwith summon a meeting of the Council. (2) It is also declared to be the friendly right of each member of the League to bring to the attention of the Assembly or of the Council any circumstances whatever affecting international relations which threaten to disturb international peace or the good understanding between nations upon which peace depends.

2. **Article 12.** The members of League agreed to settle disputes arising between them either through arbitration or judicial settlement or inquiry by the Council. They were not to resort to war until three months after the award by the arbitrators of the judicial decision, or the report by the Council.

3. **Article 13.** The members of the League agreed that in case of any dispute between members which they considered suitable for submission to arbitration or judicial settlement and which could not be satisfactorily settled by diplomacy, they would submit the same to arbitration of judicial settlement.

4. **Article 15.** All disputes between members of the League, which were not submitted to arbitration or judicial settlement under Article 13, would be submitted to the Council. The Council was required to make efforts to settle the dispute. If the efforts of the Council proved successful it was expected to make a settlement to the public giving such facts and explanations regarding the dispute and the terms of settlement thereto as the Council considered appropriate. Likewise, if the dispute was not thus settled

the Council was to publish a report containing a statement of the facts of the dispute as well as the recommendations which were considered just and proper by the Council

5 Article 16 (i) Should any Member of the League resort to war in disregard of its covenants under Article 12, 13 or 15, it shall *ipso facto* be deemed to have committed an act of war against all other members of the League, which hereby undertake immediately to subject it to the severance of all trade or financial relations, the prohibition of all intercourse between their nations and the nations of the covenant breaking state, and the prevention of all financial, commercial or personal intercourse between the nationals of the covenant-breaking state and the nationals of any other state whether a member of the League or not

(ii) It shall be the duty of the Council in such case to recommend to the several Governments concerned what effective military, naval or air force the members of the League shall severally contribute to the armed forces to be used to protect the covenants of the League

(iii) The members of the League agree further that they will mutually support one another in the financial and economic measures which are taken under this Article in order to minimize the loss and inconvenience resulting from the above measures, and that they will mutually support one another in resisting any special measures aimed at one of their members by the Covenant-breaking state and that they will take the necessary steps to afford passage through their territory to the forces of any of members of the League which are co-operating to protect the covenants of the League

(iv) Any member of the League which has violated any covenant of the League may be declared to be no longer a member of the League by a vote of the Council concurred in by the representatives of all other members of the League represented thereon

The obligations of the League were also to apply to non-members In case a non-member did not accept the procedure for peaceful settlement laid down by Covenant, the Council could take such measures and make such recommendations which prevented hostilities and resulted in settlement of dispute

Critical Evaluation

According to Jacob and Atherton there were two shortcomings in the system of collective security under the League

1 Members of the League strictly limited the circumstances in which they would consider forceful action by a state a violation of the Covenant and hence, unlawful This left large areas of permissible hostility, extending to full-scale war, for which the League of Nations had no responsibility

2. The League lacked clear legal authority to undertake enforcement action until an act of war, violating the Covenant had actually occurred.

EFFORTS FOR SECURITY UNDER LEAGUE

Failure of Peace Settlement

After the enormous destruction caused by World War I, the statesmen and diplomats assembled at Paris were convinced of the need of establishing a system of international relations based on co-operation and collective enforcement of peace. France had this desire particularly strong because, as Langsam puts it, "Twice within the living memory of men had the pounding of German military boots been heard on the French soil and the citizens to Third Republic were fearful of still another incursion." Therefore during the Peace Settlement, France insisted on having a 'physical guarantee' through possession of the Rhine and its bridges. The Allies, however, declined to comply with this request of France on the plea that it involved the separation of more than five million Germans from their motherland. But, the treaty of Versailles provided a clause for the occupation of the left bank of Rhine by the Allied forces for a period of fifteen years. This area was to be permanently demilitarised. Besides, U.S.A. and U.K. offered to sign a guarantee treaty by which they were to assist France in the event of any unprovoked aggression by Germany. However, due to the failure of U.S.A. to ratify the treaties signed at Versailles these treaties were rendered void.

Now France resorted to a policy of force and occupied Ruhr to ensure security by breaking the industrial backbone of Germany. However, due to the passive resistance of the Germans the occupation of Ruhr proved to be a losing proposition. This also cost France the ill-will of Britain.

Collective Security Through League

France also tried to use the League of Nations for ensuring her security, through the enforcement of the principle of collective security. In the words of Schuman the system of collective security, meant "the co-operative coercion of the peace breaking state by the peace-loving states". This system provided: (a) the nations agreed to abide by the rules of behaviour laid down by a common international authority; (b) agreed not to go to war for the settlement of their disputes; and (c) the nations were to treat an act of war by any state against any member of the League of Nations as an act of war against all of them and they were to come to the assistance of the victim of aggression.

But at the general meeting of the League in Geneva it was decided that the nature of sanction to be applied against the aggressor would be decided by the government of each state. This decision considerably weakened the system of collective security set up by the League Covenant. This prompted France to take recourse to the pre-war pattern of diplomatic alliances. Simultaneous efforts for security through League also continued.

1 Draft Treaty of Mutual Assistance 1923 To strengthen the League of Nations a treaty was drawn in 1923 by the efforts of France Aggressive war was declared an international crime The League Council was to name the aggressor within four days of the aggression The member states of the League were to render military or economic assistance to the aggrieved country The states lying outside the war zone were not to be asked to render military help to the victim of aggression With the approval of the Council the League members could enter into alliances to supplement their obligations under the Covenant

The treaty was accepted only by 18 states excluding U S A Soviet Russia and Great Britain Thus the Draft Treaty of Mutual Assistance fell down and the first attempt at strengthening the League of Nations failed

2 Geneva Protocol 1924 By 1924 the Ruhr occupation by France and Belgium proved to be a total failure and the reparation problem was partially settled by the Dawes Plan Thus fresh efforts could be made at ensuring security The Geneva Protocol drafted by the Greek and Czech representatives made such efforts in 1924

It proposed

1 Compulsory arbitration as the only legal means of settling international disputes and declared any aggressive war as an international crime
2 Signatories were required to accept the compulsory jurisdiction of the Permanent Court of International Justice in all legal disputes
3 The political disputes were to be referred to the League Council However if the League Council failed to reach a unanimous decision the Council was to entrust the responsibility of taking decisions to a Committee of arbitrators The states were obliged to accept the decisions of the arbitrator
4 The members agreed to maintain peace and not to mobilise forces while the arbitration was going on
5 The protocol defined the aggressor, as a state which refused to accept arbitration
6 The Council was entitled to sanction economic boycott or use of force against the aggressor as a disciplinary measure
7 In the event of a war reparation was to be imposed on the aggressor for the offense of starting war The amount of reparation was to be determined keeping in view the financial and economic capacity of the aggressor
8 On the recommendations of Japan even domestic affairs were placed under the jurisdiction of the League Council

9. The protocol laid more emphasis on world security instead of regional security.

10. The question of security was linked up with the question of reduction of armaments. The protocol fixed June 15, 1925 as the date of disarmament conference. The Conference was to be held only if sufficient number of states had ratified the Protocol by that time.

Significance of Geneva Protocol

The big powers opposed while the small powers supported the Geneva Protocol. Hence the Protocol was ultimately abandoned. The Geneva Protocol had the following significance:

1. It was a grand plan devised for the international security.
2. It established an indisputable test of identifying the aggressor.
3. It made arbitration compulsory in all cases of disputes.
4. It banned all wars except those fought in defence of the territorial integrity of a state in pursuance of the sanction enforced by the League or to enforce the decision of the World Court.
5. It removed some of the defects of the League Covenant.

(i) Though the League Covenant had certain provisions regarding the settlement of international disputes, but it was not clear regarding the measures to be applied in case of difference of opinion in the League Council. The Geneva Protocol provided for the system of arbitration under such situation.

(ii) Again, the League Council under the Covenant had no right to interfere in the domestic disputes. The Geneva Protocol prescribed arbitration through the League Council in such cases also.

(iii) Whereas earlier the League Council could not take proper and timely action against any state guilty of aggression, the Geneva protocol proposed for armistice.

Thus the Geneva Protocol tried to remove some of the legal defects of the Covenant and was the first genuine attempt to strengthen the League Council.

3. Locarno Pact. In October, 1925 delegates from seven states (Belgium, England, France, Czechoslovakia, Germany, Italy and Poland) met at Locarno in Switzerland and concluded a number of agreements termed as 'Locarno Agreements'.

4. The Kellog-Briand Pact 1928. The urge to avert war and maintain peace gave birth to yet another pact in August 1928, known as Pact of Paris or Kellog-Briand Pact of August 27, 1928.

5 **The General Act.** Acting on the pattern of Locarno Treaties, the League Assembly collected a series of agreements into a General Act for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes declared open for accession in September, 1938 The Act provided for (a) a Permanent Conciliation Commission to recommend amiable settlement of disputes among the signatories These recommendations were, however, not to be of binding nature (b) All legal disputes were to be referred to the Permanent Court of International Justice and its decision was to be binding on the members (c) The non-legal issues were to be referred to a Committee of arbitrators By the end of 1938 only 35 states had accepted this Act Thus the last attempt by the League of Nations to establish a system of collective security ended in a failure

LOCARNO PACT

Background of Locarno Pact

The history of Locarno Pact may be traced back to the years following the World War I France saw in Germany a potential future danger though Germany was defeated in the war and very severe terms were imposed on her This was because, as Langsam puts it "twice within the living memory of men had the pounding of German military boots been heard on the French soil and the citizens of Third Republic were fearful of still another incursion " Therefore, during the Peace Settlement of 1919 France insisted on having a 'physical guarantee' through possession of Rhine This demand was, however, turned down by the Allies on the ground that it involved the separation of more than five million Germans from their motherland France was keen to gain 'guarantee' by striking at the root of German failure to make reparation payments in full To strengthen her security France embarked upon the policy of alliances with less important powers She concluded alliances with Belgium (1920), Poland (1921), Czechoslovakia (1924) etc France wanted to perpetuate her ascendancy and keep Germany in subjection by these treaties

On the other hand, Germany was equally bitter The terms offered to her by the Allies were very harsh She was held guilty for the war She was required to pay huge reparations France and Belgium captured the Ruhr Valley, which was the very heart of German industry France even made an attempt to set up a separatist state in the Rhineland According to Langsam, "Discontented workers and radicals, released convicts and rowdies from all over Germany were imported into the Rhineland and encouraged to proclaim the region independent" Thus the Germany and France suspected each other. France was haunted by the spectre of German recovery and revenge Germany was afraid of French designs on the Rhineland and her economic strength Therefore, no permanent peace could be possible unless the countries were able to arrive at some sort of understanding. Germany made an offer to France to enter into a mutual agree-

ment not to resort to war for a generation as early as 1922. France was in no mood to accept the German offer.

The Treaty of Rapallo signed between Germany and Russia in 1922 caused great anxiety to the western powers, who were more concerned with the Bolshevik menace rather than a possible revival of German militarism. In order to detach Germany from the influence of Soviet Russia, it was felt essential to strike a balance between Germany and France. By that time France had realised that she had gained nothing substantial by the occupation of the Ruhr Valley and she had been completely isolated. Germany was completely exhausted. The Labour Government in England was inclined towards a settlement between France and Germany. Thus for the first time since 1919 British, German and French were in a mood of compromise. The coming into power of Briand in France and Stresemann in Germany further facilitated the task. Stresemann made a proposal for 'Rhineland Pact' on January 10, 1925 whereby France, Germany, Great Britain and Italy were to jointly guarantee the Franco-German border. Germany was now reaffirming her acceptance not only of the loss of Alsace and Lorraine but also of the demilitarization of the Rhineland. This was welcomed by France who insisted that her allies, Poland, Belgium and Czechoslovakia, should also be invited to participate in the talks.

Constituents of Locarno Pact

Delegates from seven states (Belgium, England, France, Czechoslovakia, Germany, Italy and Poland) met at Locarno in Switzerland, in October 1925, in the most cordial atmosphere, concluded a number of agreements. All these Agreements collectively termed as Locarno Pact, were formally signed by the powers in London on December 1, 1925.

1. Treaty of Mutual Guarantee (Rhineland Pact). It was concluded between Belgium, Britain, France, Germany and Italy with the following provisions :

1. Germany, Belgium and France agreed to renounce war against each other and to settle all their controversies by peaceful methods like adjudication, conciliation, commission and League machinery.

2. Rhineland was demilitarized. The Franco-German and Belgo-German frontiers were fixed by the Treaty of Versailles.

3. Any complaint regarding violation of the terms of the treaty was to be addressed to the League Council, and if the Council confirmed the complaint, the guarantors were to come to the assistance of the aggrieved party.

4. If there was a flagrant aggression, the guarantors were to act at once though they would at the same time bring the dispute before the Council.

2. Arbitration Treaties between Germany and Poland and between Germany and Czechoslovakia. On England's refusal to guarantee German

Eastern frontiers Germany was compelled to conclude two separate treaties with Poland and Czechoslovakia The signatories agreed to refer their dispute to a Permanent Conciliation Commission for amicable settlement If the dispute could not be thus settled, the matter was to be referred either to an arbitral tribunal or to the Permanent Court of International Justice

3 **Treaties of guarantee between France and Poland and France and Czechoslovakia.** By these treaties the signatories agreed to aid and assist each other if any country endangered the interests of any one of them through unprovoked recourse to arms

4. **Arbitration Convention between Germany and Belgium and Germany and Czechoslovakia.** The signatories agreed to settle their mutual differences by peaceful means either through Permanent Conciliation Commission or through an arbitral tribunal The dispute could also be referred to the League Council for settlement The signatory states to Locarno Agreements also promised to put into practice the principle of disarmament. A preparatory Commission was formed to make necessary arrangements for the proposed World Disarmament Conference In 1926, Germany entered the League of Nations as a permanent member

Critical Estimate of Locarno Pact

1. **Most Significant diplomatic event.** The Locarno pact have been regarded as the most significant event in the diplomatic history of the world In the words of Carr, "It struck, for the time since the war, a fair and impartial balance between French and German needs It completed the work which the Dawes Plan had begun by bringing Germany back into the family of Great Powers, not indeed on terms of complete equality (for the servitudes of disarmament and demilitarisation remained) but as a full and respected member"

2. **End of Anti-German Attitude** The Locarno Agreements marked an end of the anti-German attitude of the victors An amicable settlement was reached with regard to many outstanding questions For instance Germany gave up all claims with regard to Alsace-Lorraine and France on her part abandoned all hopes for a Rhineland protectorate.

3. **Favourable impact on international relations in Europe.** In the words of Gathorne Hardy, "The sense of improved security which the British Guarantee implanted in the minds of Germans and Frenchmen and an importance for outweighing that of the question whether, on occasion arising, it would prove for Great Britain to fulfil her obligation...So long, however, as British intervention was feared by the potential aggressors of both sides, it seemed unlikely that the reality of the Pact would be put to the test. To scare the war maker from his purpose is a more useful task than to arrest or defeat him when his offense has been committed At the time of its adoption,

at any rate, the Locarno Pact was a most effective and formidable looking scare-crow, which went far to justify the opinion of its creator, Mr. Austen Chamberlain, that its erection "marked the real dividing line between the years of war and the years of peace."

4. Balance between Germany and France. The Locarno Treties struck a reasonable balance between the German needs of treaty revision and the French desire for security and continuation of the *status quo.* Thus all the powers who met at Locarno were eager to put an end to the chaos and conflict of the preceding years.

Now Germany took upon herself the obligations of the Versailles Treaty, which she had been refusing to accept as binding on her. She became a member of the League and was given a permanent seat.

Defects of Locarno Pact

1. Illusory Sense of Security. The sense of security created by the Locarno Pact was illusory in character. Though Germany and her cosignatories agreed to resolve their disputes through peaceful methods, the 'disputes arising out of the events prior to the present convention and belonging to the past' were not covered by this pact.

2. Sinister as well reassuring. With the disappearance of the 'good times' the reassuring features disappeared but the sinister features implied that the Treaty of Versailles was not sacrosanct enough to be observed scrupulously unless supported by subsequent agreements.

3. Destructive of Versailles Treaty and League Covenant. Carr asserted that "in the long run, the Locarno treaty was destructive both of the Versailles Treaty and to the Covenant". It encouraged the view that the Treaty of Versailles, unless confirmed by other engagements of a voluntary character, lacked binding force. It maintained that the government could not be expected to take military action in defence of frontiers in which they were not directly interested.

4. Problem of Germany's Eastern Frontier. While Locarno Pact resolved the problem of Germany's western frontiers through the abandonment of the German and French demands over Alsace-Lorraine and the Rhineland respectively, the problem of Germany's eastern frontiers remained unsolved. The British refusal to defend the eastern frontiers of Germany increased the burden of France. It imposed upon her the special responsibility of protecting the eastern frontier. She was unwilling to accept the responsibility of collective security, as enshrined in the League Covenant.

5. Old disputes continued. Though the Locarno Agreements were unanimously accepted by the powers, some of the old disputes continued to exist below the surface. For example, though the German government had reconciled to the loss of Alsace-Lorraine. Eupen and Malmedy there

remained, as Prof Schuman has put it, "fostering wound in the hearts of all patriots and none could abandon the hope of recovering these territories in the future" Clemenceau admitted that "the Locarno Pact offers only the fragile appearance of a guarantee It is an illusion which will delude facile minds and put vigilance to sleep The spirit of Locarno is itself a threat to the interests of our country"

6. Beneficial only to Germany. The Locarno Treaty proved beneficial only to Germany It weakened the French alliance system It hastened the evacuation of the Rhineland It led to the readmission of Germany in the family of European nations It provided Germany with an opportunity to rearm her-self It did practically nothing in respect of disarmament, strengthening of security or improvement in the League system The spirit friendliness and goodwill, described as 'the spirit of Locarno' was only short-lived With the rise of Hitler Germany denounced the Locarno Treaties as unscrupulously as any other Treaty

KELLOG-BRIAND PACT

Historical Narration

The Pact of Paris or Kellog-Briand Pact of August 27, 1928, was the most important of the efforts to avert war and maintain peace after the First World War It tried to 'out-law war' It carried the principle of 'pacification' further

Briand, the Foreign Minister of France and Kellog, the U S Foreign Secretary were the chief architects of this pact In April, 1927 the French Minister Briand, proposed to the U S Government that the two countries should renounce war as an instrument of national policy and that they should agree to settle all disputes arising between them by pacific means U S Foreign Secretary Kellog suggested that the proposed treaty should be universal so as to include all or most of the states France proposed that the pact should be confined only to 'wars of aggression' Failing to gain the cooperation of U S A on this point Briand agreed to general renunciation of war

The American Government sent the draft to Germany, Italy, Great Britain and Japan In these countries the public opinion rallied behind the proposed draft treaty People asked their government to accept it

Delegates from fifteen states U S , U K , Japan, Germany, France, Italy, Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Poland, South Africa, New Zealand, Canada, British Dominions and India signed a treaty for the renunciation of war on August 27, 1928 This is known as Pact of Paris or Kellog-Briand Pact Russia also accorded her consent through the good offices of France Sixty-two states had signed the Pact by 1930

Provisions of the Pact

1. Rejection of War. The signatory states agreed not to have recourse to war for the settlement of international controversies. They renounced war as an instrument of national policy in their relations with each other.

2. Pacific Means. The members agreed to settle all their disputes or conflicts by pacific means.

3. War Mongers denied. The members who sought to promote their national interest by resort to war were to be denied the benefits of the treaty.

Critical Estimate

1. Peace through Pact. The Kellog-Briand Pact was a great landmark in the attempt to establish world peace through pacts. As the first political agreement in the world history which received approbation of public opinion throughout the world, it demonstrated the willingness of the states to pronounce a ban on war as a legitimate means of settling their disputes. To quote Gathorne Hardy, "It served at the moment as a magnificent advertisement of the pacific disposition of the world, and might have been thought to constitute a great step forward on the road to international security".

2. Basis for Big nation Unity. In this for the first time since the World War U.S.A. and Soviet Union entered into treaty relations. The Pact thus created a basis upon which the great nations could take direct interest in the collective organisation of peace outside the League.

Limitations of the Pact

1. Self Defence unimpaired. The pact left self defence unimpaired. The British were insistent that it was not to interfere with areas vital to the interest of a state and made special regional reservations.

2. Applied to Wars of Aggression only. The pact was to apply only to 'wars of aggression'. It was not to apply to obligations assumed under the League Covenant. It said nothing for the fulfilment of obligations under previous treaties of Locarno agreement. To quote Langsam, "Unfortunately the efficacy of this 'out-lawry of war' was considerably lessened by the qualifications and interpretations placed upon the text by a number of signatories. In effect, war was out-lawed except (1) when resorted to in self-defence; (2) in the execution of obligations assumed under previous treaties; or (3) in fulfilment of responsibilities incurred through the signing of the League Covenant or the Locarno agreements. Great Britain, moreover, made a special reservation with regard to 'certain regions of the world the welfare and integrity of which constitutes a special and vital interest for our peace and safety.'

3. No effective enforcement. The Pact did not provide any effective means of enforcement. It only provided that a state violating its obligations would lose the advantages secured by it as a signatory. As Langsam says,

"The Pact was founded on the hope that public opinion might be strong and influential enough, even in times of emergency, to restrain any particular nation from violating what were simply moral obligations" Therefore, nothing could be done to restrain their actions as a result when Japan and Italy acted in flagrant violations of the pact

4 **No provision for sanctions** The Pact did not provide express or implied sanctions There was no obligation or commitment of signatories to the treaty to engage in punitive or coercive measures against the nation violating the treaty

5. **Failure of Public opinion.** Japan used military forces in Manchuria Germany against Austria and Italians against Ethiopia supported by the people of these countries Thus the only sanction claimed for the Pact of Paris the public opinion itself proved to be a failure

6. **No method to identify violation** The Pact did not specify any method for identifying whether a particular act constituted a violation of Pact or not

7. **No specification of means of Pacific settlement.** The Pact did not specify the means of pacific settlement which the signatories were to employ in the event of an aggression or conflict

8. **Challenge to League Covenant** As Carr has pointed out, instead of reinforcing the League Covenant the Pact constituted a serious challenge to it To quote Carr, "The Pact of Paris was a moral declaration based on a general sense of the sinfulness of war The Covenant was a political treaty based in its essential provision, on what the statesmen of 1919 deemed practicable and expedient The Pact condemned all wars but punished none. The Covenant allowed some wars, and prohibited others, but prohibited wars it punished" The League Covenant provided the means for resisting all kinds of war and aggression On the other hand, the Paris Pact did not provide any express or implied sanctions Therefore, when during the Russo-Chinese hostilities over the Chinese Eastern Railway, the signatories to the Pact reminded Russia of her obligations under the Pact She maintained that 'The Pact of Paris does not give any single state or group of states the right to act as a Protector' Thus the Pact posed a serious challenge to the League Covenant

Importance of the Pact

1. **Considerable Landmark.** In spite of the above imperfections and defects it cannot be denied that "The Pact of Paris was a considerable land-mark. It was the first political agreement in history of almost universal scope"

2. Basis of Action by Great Powers. According to Gathorne Hardy, "It was particularly important in that it created a basis upon which the great nations outside the League, the United States and Russia, could take a direct interest in the collective organisation of peace."

3. Agreements for Peace and Assistance. The Pact resulted in a host of bilateral and multilateral agreements for non-aggression and mutual assistance. These treaties displayed a major effort to achieve collective security outside the League of Nations.

4. Break in American Isolation. The Pact marked a break in American policy of isolation. Now U.S.A. emerged as a leader of the world system outside the League of Nations.

COLLECTIVE SECURITY OUTSIDE THE LEAGUE

After the conclusion of Peace Treaty at Paris the European diplomats made frantic efforts for security both within and outside the League. Following were the chief efforts for security made outside the framework of the League:

1. The French Alliances for Security. Between the two world wars French desire for security was the most persistent single factor in the European politics. While she continued to make efforts for security through the League, she also continued frantic efforts to conclude alliance with less important powers to strengthen her security. France concluded alliances with Belgium (1920), Poland (1921), Czechoslovakia (1924), Romania (1926), Yugoslavia (1927). These treaties provided for consultations on security problems, common defence in case of aggression, and common action in the event of any threat to *status quo.*

2. The Little Entente. A Hungarian journalist coined the term 'Little Entente' to describe the system of alliance between Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia and Romania. These powers were mainly created out of the Hungarian territory. Hence they joined hands with the only object of keeping Hungary in check. They were determined to defend the European peace settlement as effected by the Treaty of Versailles and other peace treaties. The· were prepared to resist the attempts for the restoration of the Hapsburgs.

Treaties of Little Entente

The Little Entente came into being through the Czech-Romanian Treaty (April 23, 1921); the Yugoslav-Romanian Treaty (June 7, 1921) and Czech-Yugoslav Alliance (August 31, 1922). There were treaties of alliance concluded in 1921 and 1922 between each pair of members.

There developed close collaborations and consultations between these three countries during the years 1922 and 1933. To keep an eye on the settlement in Eastern Europe they held periodic conferences.

Action by France

The aims of the Little Entente Powers fitted in well with the French foreign policy of maintaining *status quo* in Europe Therefore, France consistently worked to establish her influence over the Little Entente Powers She agreed to strengthen the Entente Powers by providing them with war materials and military experts Therefore, these three powers became France's faithful satellites in foreign affairs On her part France promised to help the Czechs against Magyars and the Yugoslavs against the Italian dictator As Carr puts it, "It became a recognised French interest to support Poland against Lithuania, Czechoslovakia against Hungary and Yugoslavia and Romania against Bulgaria, and even to save her friends from the inconvenience of a too rigorous interpretation of their obligations towards their minorities"

Economic Disaster of Thirties

The Economic disaster of the thirties underlined the need of cooperation between the three powers to overcome it In February 1933 the Little Entente converted itself into an international body which was provided with a Permanent Council and a Secretariat The Permanent Council consisted of the foreign ministers of the three states and of delegates specially appointed for that purpose It was obliged to meet at least three times a year It was expected to take unanimous decisions A unanimous consent of the Council was required for every political treaty of each state of the Little Entente, every unilateral act changing the actual political situation of one of the states, and every economic agreement involving important political consequences

Defence Problems

The Little Entente held frequent discussion on military and defence problems The military strength of Little Entente was important Backed by the Anglo-French powers it could administer a serious check to Hitler's ambitions in Europe However the decision of the Western powers to abandon Czechoslovakia in the Munich Pact sealed the fate of the Little Entente Admitting the strength of the Little Entente Churchill said, "Taking singly, the three countries of the Little Entente may be called powers of the second rank, but they are very powerful and vigorous states, and united they are a great power Together they make the complement of a great power Romania has the oil, Yugoslavia has the minerals and the raw materials Both have large armies, both are mainly supplied with ammunitions from Czechoslovakia"

3. The Balkan Pact or Balkan Entente (1934). Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia and Romania had been drawn together after the war by common fear of Hungary. Yugoslavia, Romania and Greece were united by the common hostility to Bulgaria Even Turkey joined hands with them Therefore, the Balkan Pact was signed on February 9, 1934 with the preamble that the

contracting parties wished to contribute to the consolidation and peace in the Balkans. The Balkan powers agreed to respect each other's frontier and to consult each other on matters of common interest. Without mutual discussion no state was to embark on any political action towards any other Balkan country. Without the consent of the other contracting parties they could not assume any responsibility towards any other Balkan state.

Contradicting Parties

The 'Balkan Entente' proved a fragile structure because of the contradicting parties. Yugoslavia wanted to secure herself against Italian interference in the Balkans but Greece was not willing to give such a guarantee. As he did not want to risk a conflict with the Italian navy she declared that she did not recognise any obligation to engage in hostilities with a non-Balkan power. The strained relations between Yugoslavia and Bulgaria improved. As Carr puts it "Yugoslavia stood closer to Bulgaria who was outside it, than to Greece, who was a member of it". Bulgaria was also brought into the Pact in 1938, by an agreement.

The Balkan Entente worked solidly during the initial years. A permanent council was established to ensure mutual cooperation in political and economic sphere. When King Alexander of Yogoslavia was murdered at Versailles in 1934 by a Croat terrorist and Yugoslavia appealed to the League of Nations against Hungarian and Italian complicity in the plot, the Balkan powers supported her action. The aggression of Germany and Italy in the international field and the betrayal of Czechoslovakia by England and France resulted in the disintegration of the Little Entente. It also undermined the solidarity of the Balkan Entente.

4. Rome Protocols (March 1934). These were signed by Italy, Austria and Hungary on March 7, 1934. The Protocols aimed at maintenance of peace and economic restoration of Europe on the basis of respect for the independence and rights of every state. The three states agreed to have common consultation for a policy directed towards effective collaboration between the European states and particularly between the three states. They also agreed to expand their mutual trade and commerce and to facilitate and develop the transit traffic through he Adriatic ports. Italy practically opposed the 'Anschluss' of Germany be recognising the independence of Austria.

Due to Italy's invasion of Ethiopia in 1935, formation of Rome-Berlin-Axis in 1936 and Germany's occupation of Austria in 1938 etc., the Rome Protocols failed to achieve security. Eventually they were destroyed by the Second World War.

5. Saadabad Pact. Through the Pact of Saadabad concluded in July, 1937 Turkey made an effort to bring the Middle East states closer to each other. Afghanistan, Iran, Iraq and Turkey were chief signatories to the Pact. They

agreed to preserve the territorial integrity of the member states, to refrain from interference in one another's internal affairs and to consult each other on questions of common interest Like other pacts this pact also failed to ensure regional security

6. The Scandinavian Bloc On May 27, 1938 the Scandinavian countries made an effort at regional security by signing a defensive treaty The signatories to the treaty were the Foreign ministers of Finland, Denmark, Norway and Sweden They agreed to protect these countries against the growing insecurity of small states When Russia invaded Finland in 1939-40, and Germany occupied Norway and Denmark this attempt of the Scandinavian states for ensuring regional security totally failed

7. The Baltic Pact. The security of the Baltic States was threatened due to the Nazi Revolution in Germany In November 1934 states of Lativia, Lithuania and Estonia concluded a Pact known as Baltic Pact The signatory states agreed to hold regular consultations, to cooperate in the economic and cultural spheres to direct their foreign policy in consultation with each other In 1938 the three Baltic states resolved to pursue a policy on non-alignment In 1939-40, these states were occupied by Russia and merged with Soviet Union

8. Pact of Rome or Four Power Pact (1933). On 1933 England, Italy, France and Germany signed the Pact of Rome to remove the possibility of a war in Europe The four states affirmed their faith in the obligations under the Covenant of the League of Nations They agreed to follow a policy of effective cooperation to maintain peace and to hold consultations on economic questions of common interest to Europe and particularly those pertaining to the economic restoration

In actual practice however, the Pact of Rome proved to be entirely ineffective It was never acted upon It led to estrangement between France and her satellites, because they felt that France was not bothering about them and that she cared only about her relations with Germany, Italy and England

9. London Agreements Considering the Pact of Rome as a conspiracy against her Soviet Union proposed a general non-aggression treaty to her neighbours The representatives of Russia, Afghanistan, Czechoslovakia Estonia, Lativia and Lithuania signed three agreements in 1933 The signatory states pledged to honour the inviolability of each others' territory, give military help to each other in case of foreign attack and to keep the Kellog-Briand Pact intact However, like many other agreements all these agreements, remained ineffective in practice

10 New Alliances. 1933 saw the rise of Hitler According to Gathorne Hardy, 'It was natural that the re-appearance of Germany supposed to be

animated by the ideals of the Mein Kampf and the Nazi programme should produce immediate reactions in Europe'. This led to the following Alliances:

(i) *Franco-Russian Treaty.* Franco-Russian Treaty was concluded in May 1935 between France and Russia. Russia was assured of security by the Franco-Russian Treaty.

(ii) *Polish German Non-aggression Treaty of 1934.* Poland was afraid of Russia and was eager to enter into an alliance with Germany. The rise of Hitler in Germany paved the way for this alliance. In 1934, the two signed a non-aggression treaty for ten years, as a security against Russia.

(iii) *Franco-Italian Treaty of 1935.* France was scared of a possible attack of Germany. She could not conclude any alliance with her because each feared the hegemony of the other over Europe. In 1934, however, when the Austrian Chancellor Dollfuss was assassinated by the Austrian Nazi Party, the anti-German feeling ran high in Italy. This brought the two powers together and the Franco-Italian Treaty was signed in January 1935. Now, they persuaded the neighbours of Austria to conclude non-aggression treaties with her to check Germany's efforts to remilitarise herself.

(iv) *Russo-Czechoslovakia Treaty of 1935.* The rise of Hitler and extreme militarism in Germany created alarm in Czechoslovakia. In May, 1935, she entered into a treaty of mutual assistance with Russia.

Thus the rise of Hitler and the Nazi Party in Germany inspired the European diplomats to conclude a number of treaties for regional security. However, instead of checking tension and excitement, all these regional pacts ultimately engulfed the world into World War II.

FRENCH QUEST FOR SECURITY 1920-1939

Although emerged victorious out of World War I, France was aware of the potential danger from Germany. As Langsam points out, "This feeling persisted because twice within the living memory of men had the pounding of German military boots been heard on the French soil and the citizens of Third Republic were fearful of still another incursion".

Military Alliances

After World War I France concluded a number of alliances to strengthen her position against Germany. She signed a Military Convention with Belgium in September 1920. In February 1921 she singed the Franco-Polish Treaty of Alliance, Belgium, Poland and France were brought together by the danger of common enemy—Germany. Created out of Germany Poland was afraid of Germany. France was able to secure help from Poland in the East and Belgium in the West by these treaties.

Czechoslovakia was located so near the German frontier that it could be occupied by German troops within days, or perhaps within hours In 1924 France concluded an alliance with Czechoslovakia In 1926 she concluded a treaty of friendship with Romania A similar treaty was concluded with Yugoslavia in 1927 Created by Peace Treaty Czechoslovakia, Romania and Yugoslavia eagerly defended the Peace Settlement Their policy fitted well with the French policy of maintaining *status quo* in Europe France agreed to strengthen them by providing war materials and military experts She promised to help the *Czechs against Magyars and the Yugoslavs against Italy As Carr puts it*, 'It became a recognised French interest to support Poland against Lithuania, Czechoslovakia against Hungary and Yugoslavia and Romania against Bulgaria and even to save her friends from the inconvenience of a too rigorous interpretation of their obligations towards their minorities"

Locarno Pact

Germany made an offer of Rhineland Pact in 1925 whereby France, Germany, Great Britain and Italy were to jointly guarantee the Franco German border Realising that Germany was reaffirming her acceptance of the loss of Alsace and Lorraine as well demilitarization of Rhineland, France welcomed the offer She however insisted that her allies Poland, Belgium and Czechoslovakia, should also be invited to participate Delegates from seven states England, France, Germany, Italy, Czechoslovakia, Poland and Belgium met at Locarno in Switzerland in October 1925 and concluded a number of agreements popularly termed as Locarno Pact Locarno Pact led to following measures

1 Belgium and France agreed to renounce war against each other and settle their differences by peaceful methods
2 Franco-German and Belgo-German frontiers were guaranteed and Rhineland was demilitarized
3 England and Italy agreed to act as guarantors
4 The guarantors agreed to act at once in case of flagrant aggression

Check on French Foreign Policy

By yielding to the British demand to evacuate the Ruhr and bringing in the Britishers as the guarantors of Franco-German frontiers, France agreed to give up her independent foreign policy Now she could not act independent of Great Britain Both England and America began to put pressure on France to agree to disarmament

Emergence of Hitler

French security was rendered weak with the emergence of Hitler In January 1934, Poland entered into a non-aggression pact with Germany and thereby weakened the position of France *vis-a vis* Germany In 1936, Belgium also terminated her military alliance with France On the other hand Germany succeeded in winning over Yugoslavia to her side

Treaty of Mutual Assistance

In 1935 France entered into a Treaty of Mutual Assistance with Soviet Russia to strengthen her position. France and Russia agreed to consult each other in the event of threat of an aggression by any European states and assist each other in case of un-provided aggression by any European state. The treaty was to last for five years from the date of its ratification. In actual practice, however, it remained a dead letter since France did not implement it.

Franco-Italian Treaty 1935

Ever since the Paris Treaty, the relations of France with Italy had been bitter. This rivalry expressed itself in their struggle for pre-dominance in the South Eastern Europe. With the emergence of Hitler France agreed to readjustment of colonies in Africa in favour of Italy. In 1934 the Austrian Chancellor Dollfuss was assassinated by the Austrian Nazi Party. The anti-German attitude of the two countries brought them together in January 1935 when the Franco-Italian treaty was signed. The two powers agreed to discuss their differences to encourage the neighbours of Austria to conclude non-aggression treaties with her and to check Germany's efforts to remilitarise herself.

Thus France stood in a very peculiar situation at the end of 1935. Chief of French General Staff Gamelin, summed up her position thus : "If France commits herself definitely to Russia, Germany will reply by occupying the bank of the Rhine; if Italy emerges weakened from her current difficulties in Abyssinia that means Anschluss; if there is war between Britain and Italy in the Mediterranean and we come in, Germany is prepared to move against us. Only the closest understanding between France and Britain can keep the peace from now on."

Spanish Civil War

France was involved in her domestic problems from 1936 to 1938. She could not take an active part in the foreign affairs. The policy of peace and non-intervention followed by her during the Spanish Civil War of 1936, made her completely discredited.

Franco-British Alliance

The famous Franco-British Alliance was concluded in April 1938. It was one of the most sweeping engagements of its kind since World War I. The two powers agreed to accord complete diplomatic co-operation and to establish a unitary command of the British and French military, Naval and Air Forces.

Issue of Czechoslovakia

When Hitler committed aggression against Czechoslovakia in September 1938 France was willing to go to war But Lord Halifax, the Foreign Minister of England, counselled pressure on the Czechs French agreed to put pressure on the Czechs to make maximum concessions to Hitler The representatives of Germany, France and England met at Munich on September 29 and 30, 1938 They decided the area of Czechoslovakia to be handed over to Germany Neither Czechoslovakian nor Russian represen- tatives were present at the Munich Conference

Munich Pact

It was one of the greatest follies of French diplomacy She lost the defence advantage of 35 well equipped divisions in Czechoslovakia and lost her alliance and prestige in Eastern Europe Commenting on Munich pact Churchill observed France and Great Britain had to choose between war and dishonour They chose dishonour They will have war" Hitler seized the rest of Czechoslovakia and even attacked Poland Lord Halifax took the stand that there could be no conference without cession of hostilities in Poland France was forced to declare war against Germany on September 3 1939

PEACEFUL SETTLEMENT

Paragraph I of Article I of the Charter states that the purposes of the United Nations are 'To maintain international peace and security, and to that end to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace, and to bring about by peaceful means adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace" Thus collective security and peaceful settlement are linked in the very first paragraph of the very first article of the Charter

The methods of peaceful settlement are included in the procedures which are needed to establish a genuine collective security system As the American Benjamin V Cohen, admitted "My Government regards pacific settlement and collective measures as inseparable parts of collective security under the Charter'[14]

Collective security and peaceful settlement are opposite sides of the same coin utilising very different, and indeed antithetical, methods for achieving the same ultimate goals

---

14 *Inid.* p 239

Spokesmen of non-alligned states have been inclined to play down any efforts to enforce the peace or to take collective measures against any state, except against states guilty of grave offenses against human rights and fundamental human freedoms. In a debate in the First Committee of the UN General Assembly in 1953 Madame Pandit declared, "The Indian delegation considered that there were no international problems, however complex, which could not be settled by peaceful negotiation. The United Nations should devote itself to the study of measures for the peaceful settlement and conciliation of disputes. ... It was more urgent and constructive than the study of coercive measures."[15]

Different Assumptions

Peaceful settlement is based upon a different set of assumptions and procedures. It emphasizes negotiation, consultation, arbitration, and other amicable methods rather than sanctions and other non-amicable procedures. Instead of seeking to build "situations of strength", it emphasizes recourse to all possible methods of amicable settlement and the avoidance of coercive policies or practices that may jeopardize the chances of agreement.

History of Peaceful Settlement

The origin and methods of peaceful settlement are very old indeed. The earliest existing treaty dates back to about 3000 B.C., recording the successful arbitration of a boundary dispute between Egyptian kings. The Greeks developed the mechanism for the peaceful settlement of disputes. Jay's Treaty of 1794, is often described as the beginning of the extensive use of arbitration in modern times.

Modern landmarks

1. The Hague conventions of 1899 and 1907 for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes.

2. The Covenant of the League of Nations and the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice.

3. The Protocol for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes (the so called Geneva Protocol) of 1924, which never went into effect.

4. The General Act for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes, which was adopted by the Assembly of the League of Nations in 1928.

5. The Inter-American Arbitration and Conciliation treaties drafted at the Washington Conference of 1929.

6. The Charter of the United Nations and the Statute of the International Court of Justice.

---

15. United Nations, *Official Records of the General Assembly*, 7th Sess., First Committee, Summary Records of Meetings; 575th Meeting, 12 March 1953, p. 45.

7 The studies and recommendations of various UN agencies, notably the "Little Assembly"

8 The Collective Measures Committee, the International Law Commission, and the Secretariat

9 The Charter of the Organisation of American States

10 The Pact of Bogota adopted at the Ninth Inter-American Conference in 1948

Methods of Pacific Settlement

The Charter of the United Nations lists the chief methods of pacific settlement as negotiation, enquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement, and resort to regional agencies or arrangements (Article 33) These conventional devices may be divided into two main categories (1) those based on persuasion, with no binding force Negotiation, good offices, enquiry, mediation, and conciliation fall within this category, (2) those which have a binding character as the parties commit themselves to accept the findings of a neutral board or court Arbitration and judicial settlement fall within this class

Objectives

The object of the procedures included in the first category is to bring it settlements based on the mutual agreement of the parties to disputes The object of the procedures in the second category, technically known as procedures for international adjudication, is to reach, on the basis of objective principles of international law and equity, decisions binding on the parties which agreed to submit their disputes to such adjudicator tribunals

1. Negotiation Most disputes which arise between states are settled through negotiations between diplomatic representatives These efforts may be supplemented by meetings of foreign ministers or even of heads of states, by international conferences, or by resort to machinery provided by the UN or by a regional organization such as the OAS Direct negotiation is the very heart of diplomacy Unfortunately, the relatively few instances in which this procedure fails involve real threats to peace and security, for the devices of diplomacy tend to break down in crisis situations Hence, other methods for the peaceful settlement of disputes have been developed in order to avert serious consequences

2. Good Offices and Mediation. If a third party offers to be of service in attempting to compose differences between two other states, it is said to tender its "good offices" Good offices may lead to mediation if the offer is accepted by the disputing states In good offices the third party acts simply as a friendly "go-between," whereas in mediation a mediator may make suggestions of his own In 1905 President Theodore Roosevelt tendered his

good offices to Japan and Russia to end the Russo-Japanese War. The offer was accepted, but he actually became a mediator, for he exerted a direct influence in averting a threatened impasse in the negotiations and in bringing about ultimate agreement. The same procedure was followed in 1965 and 1966 by Premier Kosygin of the Soviet Union, whose expressed willingness to extend his good offices to India and Pakistan to the Tashkent Conference. Kosygin played a decisive role behind-the-scenes in getting President Ayub Khan and Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri to reach the agreement known as the Tashkent Declaration. This was a strong and effective mediation.

The tender of good offices may be made by one or more states, or by individuals acting in an official capacity, such as the head of a state or officers of the principal organs of the United Nations. It is never regarded as an unfriendly act. The parties to a dispute are not bound to accept the offer or to regard suggestions of a mediator as binding.

3. Enquiry and Conciliation. A commission of enquiry investigates the facts of a dispute, but largely confines itself to a statement of the facts and a clarification of the issues. Although it may also present conclusions and recommendations, these are in no sense binding on the disputants. The First Hague Conference recommended the use of commissions of enquiry. The Second Hague Conference renewed this suggestion, and provisions for such commission were incorporated into many bilateral and multilateral treaties. The Assembly of the League of Nations strongly endorsed the idea in 1922. In spite of all this, however, the use of commissions of enquiry has "upon the whole ... been negligible."[16]

Conciliation differs from enquiry. It assumes an obligation on the part of third parties to take the initiative in the search for agreement. A conciliation commission may advance proposals, ask for compromise or concessions, and actively seek to effect an understanding between the contending parties. The usual difference conciliation and mediation is that mediation is commonly performed by an individual while conciliation is performed by a committee, commission, or council.

Conciliation is often held to be an especially constructive approach to those disputes which are not justiciable in nature but also are not so exclusively political. The possibilities of conciliation would seem to be great, even though they have not been utilized to the full.

Many private organizations have urged more general resort to conciliation. This method has greater flexibility than arbitration or judicial settlement. It can be adapted to a greater variety of issues. It facilitates the

---

16. Edwin D. Dickinson, *Law and Peace* (Philadelphia : University of Pennsylvanja Press, 1951), p. 71.

settlement of potentially explosive questions through the use of disinterested *and competent third parties or commissions It helps to keep them* out of the political arena in which conflicting national interests, coercive techniques and ideological antagonisms make any kind of amicable settlement difficult

4 **Arbitration and Judicial Settlement.** Arbitration differs from conciliation in a number of ways It is a judicial process, whereas conciliation is an attempt at accommodation Conciliation recommends, arbitration decides Conciliation is friendly counsel arbitration is binding decree Conciliation can take into account national honour and "face", arbitration must keep to the letter of the law

Judicial settlement, or adjudication, is in a sense a form of arbitration in which permanent court is the arbitral tribunal The Legal Section of the Secretariat of the League of Nations, explained "arbitration is distinguished from judicial procedure in the strict sense of the word by three features the nomination of the arbitrators by the parties concerned, the selection by these parties of the principles upon which the tribunal should base its findings and finally its character of voluntary jurisdiction The boundary between the two kinds of judicial procedure cannot be definitely fixed "[17] Being less impromptu than arbitration and requires permanent tribunals judicial settlement assures a larger measure of jurisdictional and procedural consistency It should also assure a somewhat more favourable climate for the progress of the law from precedent to precedent "[18]

According to Jacob and Atherton 'The submission of disputes to arbitration is a time honoured practice among states It was undertaken in medieval times and even by the Greek city-states "[19] The nineteenth century added some four hundred examples of successful arbitration to the precedents set by the arbitrations under the famous Jay's Treaty of 1794 between Great Britain and the United States

The United States stood as the foremost champion of arbitration during the nineteenth century, has slackened her interest in the present century Although she did participate in some eighty-five arbitrations up to the end of World War I in several cases she refused to arbitrate or she delayed action for many years The United States Senate rejected a number of arbitration treaties between 1890 After World War I, however, the United States did agree to arbitrate a number of cases

---

17 Permanent Court of International Justice Advisory Commission of Jurists Documents Presented to the Commission Relating to Existing Plans for the Establishment of a Permanent Court of International Justice, p 113

18 Dickinson p 73

19 Jacob and Atherton p 271

From the First Hague Conference of 1899, attempts were made to create permanent courts of arbitration to provide machinery for the judicial settlement of disputes. The Permanent Court of Arbitration established was a panel of arbitrators whose names were on file at The Hague, to be drawn upon if disputing states so chose. Despite its limitations, the Permanent Court was utilized successfully in fifteen cases before 1914. Although still in existence the "Hague Court" has been little used since the opening of the Permanent Court of International Justice in 1922.

The Permanent Court of International Justice functioned in the inter- war period in loose association with the League of Nations, and its successor, the International Court of Justice, which was brought into being in 1946 as one of the principal organs of the United Nations. Although the two courts were given different names and derived their authority from different statutes, the present International Court of Justice regards itself as a continuation of the old court. The Carnegie Peace Palane at The Hague has been the seat of both courts.

Many attempts have been made since the time of the First Hague Conference to secure the consent of states to the compulsory adjudication of disputes. These attempts have met with only limited success. Usually agreements to resort to adjudication have been hedged about by reservations in areas involving "vital interests," "matters of domestic concern," or "national honour". Thus the Hague Convention for the Pacific Settlement of Disputes called for resort to arbitration "in so far as circumstances permit."

A real advance in the prospects for compulsory adjudication was made by the Permanent Court of International Justice and the International Court of Justice. Paragraph I of Article 36 of the Statute of the former court has been used almost verbatim in the same article in the Statute of the present International Court of Justice. It is read as follows : "The jurisdiction of the Court comprises all cases which the parties refer to it and all matters specifically provided for in treaties and conventions in force." Both courts were given a wide compulsory jurisdiction through "treaties and conventions in force" and through the so-called Optional Clause, also contained in Article 36 of both statutes. This clause provided that states could of their own accord accept the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court "in all legal disputes concerning : (a) the interpretation of a treaty; (b) any question of international law; (c) the existence of any fact which, if established, would constitute a breach of an international obligation; (d) the nature or extent of the reparation to be made for the breach of an international obligation." More than half the states of the world, including all the major non-Communist powers, have accepted the Optional Clause, though with devastating reservations in some cases.

Pacific Settlement and Regional Arrangements

The United Nations Charter commends the settlement of disputes between nations not only by the conventional methods and through the normal channels of diplomacy but also by resort to regional agencies or arrangements or other peaceful means (Article 33) It also provides that the Members of the United Nations entering into such arrangements or constituting such agencies shall make every effort to achieve pacific settlement of local disputes through such regional arrangements or by such regional agencies before referring them to the Security Council (Article 52)

The Charter of the Organization of American State (OAS) devotes an entire chapter to the Pacific Settlement of Disputes (Chapter IV) and a special treaty known as the Pact of Bogota contains elaborate provisions for peaceful settlement The eight chapters of the Pact are entitled as follows (1) General Obligation to Settle Disputes by Pacific Means (2) Procedures of Good Offices and Mediation (3) Procedures of Investigation and Conciliation (4) Judicial Procedure (5) Procedure of Arbitration (6) Fulfilment of Decisions (7) Advisory Opinions (8) Final Provisions

Pacific Settlement and the United Nations

1 **Article 1** One of the major objectives of the United Nat ons as we have seen is to bring about by peaceful means and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace" Hence if all other efforts and procedures fail or if the services of the inter national organization are needed at any stage of a controversy the whole machinery of the United Nations is presumably available

2 **Article 33** The Security Council may call upon the parties to settle their disputes by the means provided for in Article 33 may investigate any dispute may at any stage of a dispute recommend appropriate procedures or methods of adjustment and may keep abreast of any procedures for the settlement of the dispute which have already been adopted bv the parties

3 **Article 37** It provides that if the parties to a dispute fail to settle it by the means indicated in Article 33 they shall refer it to the Security Council which may take such action as it considers necessary

4 **Article 41** It may resort to measures not involving the use of armed force (Article 41)

5 **Article 42** It may call upon member nations to use their armed forces

The provisions of Chapter VI of the Charter are more elaborate than the comparable ones in the Covenant of the League of Nations

Together with the provisions for judicial settlement contained in the Statute of the International Court of Justice, they seem to open the way to new and impromptu procedures by UN agencies.

The UN has continued the detailed consideration of the procedures for peaceful settlement which was carried on by the League. This work has been undertaken by a Subcommittee of the Interim Committee of the General Assembly, by the Interim Committee, by the International Law Commission, by the International Court of Justice, and by the Secretariat.

An Evaluation

Collective security and the peaceful settlement of international disputes are logical components of a single programme. The supporters of this view find it difficult to conceive of a collective security arrangement that does not provide some alternative—some machinery for peaceful settlement—to the prompt and automatic employment of armed force.

QUESTIONS FOR EXERCISE

1. Examine the System of Collective Security provided by the Covenant of the League of Nations.
2. Describe the stages by which the system of Collective Security built up under the aegis of the League of Nations broke down.
3. Define the term "Collective Security". Discuss its position under the League of Nations. How far it succeeded in preventing outbreak of hostilities ?
4. Write a short essay on the efforts made for security under the aegis of the League of Nations during the inter-war period.
5. Austin Chamberlain described the Locarno Treaty as 'the real dividing line between the years of war and the years of peace'. Comment.
6. It is often asserted that World War I did not really end with conclusion of the Treaty of Versailles of 1919 but with the conclusion of the Locarno Pacts of 1925. Do you agree with this assertion? Give reasons for your answer.
7. "In reality Locarno did not create a secure foundation for a European peace. It covered up certain deep cracks that had appeared in the building, but failed to repair the structural weakness". Discuss.
8. Write a short note on Kellog-Briand Pacts.
9. What efforts were made towards Collective Security outside the framework of the League of Nations ?
10. Write a critical note on France's Search for Security during the period between 1920-1939.

18

Mandate System and Disarmament

What was Mandate System?

According to Schumann, "The most significant international efforts to deal effectively with the problem of imperialism that of protecting native interests and that of keeping the peace among the empire builders are to be found in the Mandate System devised at the Paris Peace Conference of 1919 and administered by the League of Nations and in the Trusteeship system of the United Nations"

The League of Nations devised the Mandate system as a substitute for *the annexation of the territories which the Allied Powers had conquered from* Germany and Turkey during the World War I Provisions regarding the Mandatory System were incorporated in Article 22 of the Covenant of the League of Nations Under this system the conquered territories were placed under the guardianship of the League of Nations and certain powers were entrusted with the Mandatory Powers, consideration was given to their resources, experience, geographical position as well as willingness to accept the responsibility The people inhabiting the mandate territories were backward and unfit to stand by themselves Therefore, they were to be regarded sacred trust of civilisation Without the consent of the League of Nations, these territories could not be annexed or ceded to the Mandatory Powers

Categories of Mandate States

As the various states were at different stages of development, and their geographical situation and economic conditions differed, they were put in the three different categories

(a) Class 'A' mandate territories. These consisted of the areas which formerly belonged to the Turkish Empire and which had reached a stage of development where their existence as independent nations could be provisionally recognised. These areas were to get administrative advice and assistance from the Mandatory Powers until such time as they were able to stand on their own Great Britain was appointed Mandatory Power for Palestine, Trans-Jordan and Iraq Syria and Lebanon were put under the mandate of France The mandate with regard to Iraq ended on 1932 when she was made a member

of the League of Nations. Similarly, Lebanon and Syria were recognised as independent states during the World War II and became the original members of the United Nations.

(b) **Class 'B' mandate territories.** These consisted of the areas in respect of which the administrative responsibility was to rest with Mandatory Powers. The Mandate powers were required to guarantee freedom of conscience and religion, prohibit abuses like slave trade, the arms traffic, liquor traffic and prevent establishment of fortifications of military and naval bases. The Mandatory power was also to secure equal opportunities for the trade and commerce of other members of the League of Nations. Under this category of Mandate territories, Britain was given Tanganyika, Togoland (one-third only), and Cameroon (one-sixth only). France was entrusted with French Cameroon (one-sixth only) and Togoland (two-thirds). Belgium was given Ruanda Urundi.

(c) **Class 'C' mandate territories.** These consisted of those areas which could best be governed according to the laws of the Mandatory State owing to their small size, remoteness from centres of civilization, sparseness of population, geographical contiguity to the territory of the mandatory power. Under this category of mandate territories South West Africa was put under Union of South Africa, Samoa under New Zealand, Nauru Under Great Britain, Australia, New Zeland, former German Pacific islands north of Equator under Japan and those south of the equator under Australia.

League's Supervision over Mandate Territories

The Mandate territories although they were entrusted to the various powers were under the over-all guardianship of the League of Nations. The Mandatory Powers were required to submit an annual report to the League regarding the working of mandate. The League could also send its nominee to see the progress made by these territories.

MANDATE COMMISSION

Permanent Commission

A Permanent Mandates Commission was established in 1920 in accordance with the provisions of Article 22(9). It consisted of nine members, with a majority of nations from non-mandatory powers. To make provision for the German nation the number of the members was increased to 10 in 1927. The members of the Commission were in no way the representatives of their governments. They were appointed by the League on the basis of their personal merits and competence. The members were debarred from holding any other office under their governments which put them in a position of direct dependence on them so that it ensured their independence from their respective government.

The observations of the Permanent Mandate Commission were purely advisory However, in actual practice it became the agent of the Council, through which international supervision was exercised It received its information from the annual reports of the mandatory powers, petitions submitted by the inhabitants of the mandated regions and questioning of the representatives of mandatory government No petition opposing the mandate itself were entertained In 1927, the Council decided that petitions should not be granted oral hearings

Mandate system v/s Colonial System

The Mandatory System was an improvement over the nineteenth century system of outright annexation The mandatory powers were forbidden to do a number of things, which were possible under the earlier system

1 **No cessation** Under mandate system no territory was ceded to the mandatory power They were mere trustees These areas were entrusted to them because the people of these areas were not yet able to stand by themselves under the strenuous conditions of modern world

2 **Open door policy.** The mandatory powers of 'A' and 'B' territories were under obligation to adopt 'open door' policy by which all the states were to enjoy identical trade facilities in these areas

3. **Restriction on Army.** Mandatory powers were subjected to certain restriction with regard to the recruitment and training of the inhabitants in their army *They could enroll the local inhabitants only for the purpose of internal* police and defence However, an exception was made for France in Cameroon and Togoland

4 **Consideration to Local Wishes.** In case of 'A' mandates the wishes of the local people were to be taken into account while appointing the mandatory powers However, in actual practice this principle was not strictly adhered to For example, when Prince Feisal went to Paris in 1919 to put his views before the conference, he was not heard

5. **Nationality.** The people of the mandate territory retained their own nationality and did not acquire the nationality of the mandatory power

6. **Self Rule** The mandate system was based on the principle that ultimately independence and self-rule was to be granted to the mandate territories In 1931 the Mandates Commission laid down the following conditions under which a mandated territory could become independent

(i) It must have a settled government,

(ii) It must be capable of maintaining its territorial integrity and political *independence,*

(iii) It must be able to maintain law and order within the territory,

(iv) It must have adequate financial resources;

(v) It must guarantee protection to racial, linguistic and religious minorities; and

(vi) It must have a competent judicial organisation. In 1932 Iraq obtained independence and became a Member of the League.

7. International Supervision. The system introduce for the first time the principle of international supervision of areas which could have otherwise led to power rivalries. Assisted by the Permanent Mandate Commission the system worked under the League of Nations. Both the Council and the Assembly of the League were authorised to discuss questions relating to the state of administration in these territories. In 1926 the P.M.C. rebuked France for her mal-administration in Syria. As a result France adopted more liberal attitude towards the Syrians.

Criticism of Mandatory System

1. Hollow Mockery. The imperialist diplomats condemned the system as involving all the obligations of annexation with few of the advantages. The Germans, Americans, the Arabs and the Turks jeered at the mandate principle as a 'hollow mockery'.

2. No extra Aid. The Mandatory Governments usually refused to spend anymore money on the mandates than what they could collect by local revenues.

3. Colonialism. Though the Mandate System was the outcome of Wilson's idealism, in actual practice the mandatory powers never treated these territories as more than their colonies. In 1923 Lord Curzon, the British Foreign Secretary told the House of Lords "It is a mistake to suppose that under the Covenant of the League or any other instrument, the gift of a Mandate rests with the League of Nations. It rests with the powers who have conquered the territories which it then falls to them to distribute." The Mandatory Powers, particularly Great Britain and France, did not administer these territories as trusts. The British crushed the ambitions of the Iraqis for independence. They followed the policy of divide and rule in Palestine which resulted in frequent riots, murders and massacres. Similarly, France suppressed the Syrian nationalism and weakened her by detaching certain important cities. She used the native troops of Togoland and Cameroons for general war purposes outside these territories in complete violations of the Covenant. To quote Quincy Wright, "The system was a hypocritical sham, designed to disguise old imperialistic wolves in new sheep's clothing".

Concluding Remarks

In the words of Schuman "Regardless of these shortcomings, the Mandate system represented a significant adventure in international supervision over backward areas. The introduction of the system conveying the idea that the rulers

of these regions owed some responsibility to the civilised world as a whole for the way in which they used their power, embodied a new and fruitful idea which augured well for the future"

DEFINITION OF DISARMAMENT

1. Benjamin V. Cohen "Disarmament should be viewed as a process of creating conditions which make it difficult or impossible for nations to break or endanger the peace and not as a bargaining process to reduce the cost of preparing for war"

2 Cohen. Disarmament is "a process of creating conditions which make it difficult or impossible for nations to break or endanger the peace and not as a bargaining process to reduce the cost of preparing for war"

3. Professors Jacob and Atherton. "The strategy of disarmament is the exact reverse of collective security system and the regional security alliances Instead of trying to scare countries away from war by confronting them with a formidable 'deterrent' force, disarmament seeks to establish conditions that will assure a country that others are neither intending to attack it nor capable of doing so at least in the immediate future They strategy is to unwind rather than to build up a confrontation of armed forces"

Need For disarmament

1. To Check War. Armaments are that basic cause of all rivalries among the states A state increases its arms and ammunitions on the plea of greater security, which leads to a counter increase and thus a competition in military arms and ammunitions starts This lead to fear and suspicion in *international politics This competition and suspicion inevitably leads to war*

2 To Check Economic Waste Fantastic amounts are wasted on *armaments by the developed countries This amount may be profitably used for* amelioration the lot of people in underdeveloped countries In a speech on April 16, 1953 President Eisenhower of U S A said, "Every gun that is made, every warship launched, every rocket fired signifies, in the final sense, a theft from those who are hungry and are not fed, those who are cold and not clothed This *world in arms* in not spending money alone It is spending the sweat of its labourers, the genius of its scientists, the hopes of its children"

Efforts at Disarmament

1. Efforts by States. The Treaty of Westphalia, signed in 1648 stipulated that all existing fortifications be *demolished and no new* fortifications be erected The first systematic proposal for reduction of *armaments was mooted* by Czar of Russia in 1816 in his proposals to the British government to reduce all types of armed forces But these proposals were not received seriously. France made proposals for reduction of armaments in the years 1863 and 1869 to the Great Powers The other powers who made

proposals in this regard included Great Britain (1870) and Italy (1877). In 1898, the Tsar of Russia addressed a note to the governments of Europe top meet at Hague and devise a scheme for reducing their arms. This proposal was welcomed.

2. First Hague Conference. The First Hague Peace Conference was held at The Hague attended by the representatives of 28 states. A committee of military and naval experts was appointed to study the problem. The committee felt that the time was pre-mature for limitation of armaments. The Conference, however, adopted two declarations: (1) prohibiting the discharge of projectives and explosives from the air and (2) the use of asphyxiating gas and expanding bullets. The Conference also drew up a convention for the pacific settlement of disputes.

3. The Second Hague Conference. This was held in 1907. It was attended by forty-three states. Apart from prohibiting the use of poison or poisoned weapons during the war the Conference recommended that the governments should seriously examine the question of reducing military expenditure. But the efforts of both The Hague conferences proved unsuccessful.

4. Efforts after First World War. The devastation caused by the First World War stirred the conscience of mankind and need for abolition of arms and ammunitions was felt. President Wilson in his Fourteen points called upon the powers to reduce their armaments 'to the lowest point consistent with domestic safety'. The Treaty of Versailles took the first definite step towards the general reduction and limitation of armament by disarming the defeated power of the World War I. Article 8 of the treaty laid down that "the maintenance of peace requires the reduction of national armaments of the lowest point consistent with national safety and the enforcement by common action of international obligations."

DISARMAMENT (1921-1936)

1. Treaty of Versailles. The representatives of the Allied and Associated powers who met at Paris to conclude peace treaties examined the problem of disarmament. They felt that an abiding peace was possible only if general disarmament was introduced. A serious beginning in the direction of disarmament was made by the Treaty of Versailles, when it disarmed the defeated powers of World War I. While disarming the defeated powers it was made clear that these powers were disarmed not with a view to render it impossible for them to resume military aggression but "as the first step towards the general reduction and limitation of armaments, which is one of the most fruitful preventives of war and which it will be one of the first duties of the League of Nations to promote." Article 8 of the Versailles Treaty pleaded for reduction of national armaments of the lowest point consistent with national safety and the enforcement by common action of international obligation.

2. League of Nations When the League of Nations was established in 1920, one of the first task was to secure an agreement on the general disarmament The covenant had made the job of the League easy by incorporating a provision by which 'willingness to accept arms regulations' was made a condition of League membership [Art 1(2)] Under the Covenant the members were also expected to 'accept such obligations as may be prescribed by the League in regard to its *military, naval and air forces and armaments*"

The Covenant also provided that the League Council shall formulate plans for such reduction for the consideration and action of the several governments These were to be subject to *reconsideration and revision every* ten years The League Council set up a Permanent Advisory Committee to formulate a programme for reduction of arms But it failed to make a beginning in the direction of disarmament

3. Temporary Mixed Commission (1920-1924) In 1920 the Assembly of the League, urged the Council to create a new Commission In 1921 the Council created a Temporary Mixed Commission (TMC) This Commission was a larger body than the Permanent Advisory Committee The majority of the members of this Commission were civilians The Commission during its tenure made four important efforts for disarmament

(i).It made an effort to fix the land forces of the countries according to their national needs This proposal was, however, rejected

(ii) It tried to extend the principles of the Washington Conference of 1922 to the non-signatory powers *This treaty made an effort to limit the* naval armaments of the great naval powers of the world This too failed

(iii) It prepared the Draft Treaty of Mutual Assistance for international *aid to victims of aggression This treaty recommended arms reduction within* two years and made an indirect effort to institute 'collective security' as a basis for the reduction of armaments This treaty was also rejected by certain Great Power

(iv) The Commission produced the Geneva Protocol of 1924, which was an indirect approach to the problem of disarmament This Protocol proposed to extend the area of compulsory arbitration and imposed sanctions against aggressor states It thus created an atmosphere of security in which disarmament projects could be hopefully undertaken This too was rejected

Thus the Commission failed to achieve any conspicuous success in the field of disarmament

4 Preparatory Commission In 1925 the Preparatory Commission for a Disarmament Conference was established entrusted with the responsibility of preparing a provisional draft treaty dealing with all the principal questions relating to disarmament The Commission completed the draft treaty after a hard work of six years

5. Geneva Conference 1932. The League convened a conference at Geneva in February 1932. For the consideration of the 'Draft Convention on Reduction and Limitation of Armaments' submitted by the Preparatory commission for the Disarmament Conference. Sixty-only states, including five nonmembers of League, participated in the Conference. After two years of deliberation, the Conference reached general agreement regarding prohibition of certain weapons such as bombs dropped from aeroplanes or balloons, incendiary and bacterial weapons, chemical, etc. international supervision of arms business and publicity of arms budget.

On December 18, 1933 Germany in a Memorandum pointed out that while she was genuinely discharging the disarmament obligations embodied in the Treaty of Versailles, the other heavily-armed states either had no intention of disarming or did not feel in a position to do so, and that if these states did not undertake not to exceed the present level of their armaments Germany would also not abide by her obligations. The emergence of Hitler and his determination to rid his country from the severity of the peace terms, made disarmament rather impossible. In October 1933, Germany withdrew from the Disarmament Conference.

In May 1934 the Disarmament Conference again assembled. A deadlock took place between Russia and France on one hand and England, Italy and U.S.A., on the other. While Russia and France put emphasis on security, England, Italy and Italy and U.S.A. attached more importance to disarmament. On June 11, 1934, the Conference was adjourned *sine die* and never met again.

Disarmament outside League

1. Washington Conference 1921-22. The Washington Conference of 1921-22 was the most important, of all the attempts at disarmament made outside the League. After long deliberations a treaty was ultimately signed between Great Britain, U.S.A., France, Japan and Italy. This treaty is popularly known as the Five Power Treaty. By this treaty the naval strength of the signatory states was fixed at 525,000 for U.S.A. and Britain each, 31,500 for Japan and 175,000 for France and Italy. No agreement could, however, be reached regarding Cruisers, Submarines, Destroyers and Aircrafts. By another treaty between these five powers the use of poisonous gas in warfare was outlawed and restrictions were imposed on the use of submarines. This treaty, however, remained unratified.

The Washington conference failed to achieve much success due to French opposition.

2. Geneva Conference 1927. As the Washington Conference failed to achieve much success. President Coolidge of U.S.A. convened a second Naval Conference in Geneva in 1927. It was attended by three powers England, Japan

and U S A Soon violent differences developed between U S A and England over the issue of cruisers, and the Conference failed

3 London Naval Treaty 1930 The differences between Britain and U S A were resolved by this treaty Though originally the conference was attended by the representatives of U S A Japan, France, Italy and Britain ultimately the treaty was signed only by U S A Britain and Japan France and Italy refused to sign it The Treaty of London also could not achieve much in the matters of naval disarmament The real purpose of the treaty completely failed when the three signatory states extorted the right of reservation for thamselves The Conference also agreed that in case of any deterioration in situation any participant to this Conference would have the right to rearmament In this clause lay the germs of the failure of this Conference

4 London Naval Conference 1935-36 The Conference met at a time when international conditions were quite unfavourable Japan had committed aggression upon Manchuria Germany had remilitarised Rhineland in violation of the Treaty of Versailles In view of the mounting tension in the sphere of international politics, the conference was bound to fail, as it did

5 Anglo-German Naval Agreement 1935 To protect her interests against the possible German aggression in 1935 (June) Britain concluded an agreement with Germany by which she conceded a right to Germany to increase her battleship to 35 per cent of the British naval power and to build ships of various types

Rearmament

By the beginning of 1937 as Schumann has put it "all treaties imposing quantitative restrictions on the three Great Naval Powers were at end Britain and Germany had agreed (June 18, 1935) that the German navy should be 35 per cent as large as the British Anglo Soviet negotiations for a naval pact came to nothing' U S A proceeded to strengthen the fortifications of its basis in Western pacific England announced plans for construction of 2,38,000 tons of new battleships U S A and Japan followed suit Germany armed herself for the day of glory and her neighbours armed desperately in self-defense In the words of Schumann., "Each power sought safety in matching its potential enemies, regiment for regiment, bombing plane for bombingplane, battleship for battleship In this there could be no security but only the promise of disaster" To quote Schumann again,"The letters of failure written large over the portals of successive disarmament conferences during the two decades after Versailles became letters of impending catastrophe for Western World"

Causes for Failure of Disarmament

1. National Aggrandisement Almost all the states were interested in strengthening their position rather than in reducing the weapons For

example, France wanted that effective security arrangements mush precede disarmament. She wanted a firm commitment from U.S.A. and Great Britain regarding the defence of European frontiers. Similarly, Japan wanted parity in naval armaments with other naval powers at the London Naval Conference and again, she resorted to armed attack of Manchuria in violation of her international obligations. Germany under Hitler, was also very keen to wipe out the humiliation piled on her by the Treaty of Versailles. To undo the harm done by the Versailles Treaty she resorted to armament at the earliest available opportunity. She pleaded for arms equality with other leading powers and when it was denied to her, she left the Disarmament Conference in 1933. Likewise the Fascist regime of Italy and the Communist regime of U.S.S.R. were more interested in promoting their national interests and strengthening their respective position in the world than reducing the tension through disarmament.

2. Failure of League. The failure of the League to deal effectively with states like Japan, Italy, Germany etc., who resorted to arms in violation of their obligations under the Covenant of the League, proved another stumbling block in the way of achieving disarmament.

3. Difference of Opinion. Difference of opinion among the members of the Disarmament Conference particularly England, France, U.S.A. and Germany on various issues also created complications. France argued that it was dangerous for the people to lay down arms until the total police power of the world was sufficient to guarantee the safety of the individual countries. She pleaded 'demonstrate security and disarmament will follow'. Britain took the stand that the presence of great armaments makes the nations feel insecure. This impasse was the chief cause of inaction and led to the failure of the Draft Treaty of Mutual Assistance and the Geneva Protocol. Similarly differences existed between the attitude of Germany and France. While France insisted on 'superiority in armaments over Germany' on the ground of security, Germany demanded equality in respect of armaments and demanded restoration of her original position. These differences contributed greatly to the failure of efforts at disarmament.

4. Lack of distinction between aggressive (offensive) and defensive (non-aggressive) weapons. While England considered submarine as an aggressive arm most of the other states considered it defensive weapon, because it was the mainstay of naval defence. To quote Strausz-Hupe and Possony: "Defensive and offensive are relative terms which have no meanings if used against one opponent, and defensive value if used against another. In a war against Italy or Spain, the French army of 1939 would have had offensive character. The same army, however, in its war against Germany proved to be no less than a defensive force."

5 Focused attention solely on the reduction of armaments and war equipments Statesmen paid no attention to the economic, psychological and political conditions prevailing in various countries on which the success of disarmament problem largely rested The actual reduction of arms should *have been preceded by psychological* disarmament In the presence of mutual distrust and suspicion, fear and hatred everywhere, no disarmament could be possible

POST- WAR DISARMAMENT

The chaotic condition created by the First World War and continuing reshuffle among the nations led the countries to find out a better strategy then the system of collective security on the system of disarmament Internal order could only be secure by the effective disarmament of "over-mighty subjects" and the State's unquestioned monopoly of armed force

It was believed by all the nations that the problem of war could not be resolved without disarmament They believed that for a stable world peace and international co operation, it was necessary to bring about disarmament

Meaning of Disarmament

The word 'disarmament' is utilised in an extremely general sense and, as such it connotes the idea of the limitation, or control, or reduction of armaments In the words of Professors Jacob and Atherton, "The strategy of disarmament is the exact reverse of collective security system and the regional security alliances Instead of trying to scare countries away from war by confronting with a formidable deterrent force, disarmament seeks to establish that conditions that will secure a country that others are neither intending to attack it nor capable of doing so at least in the immediate future The strategy is to unwind *rather than to build up a conformation of armed forces* " *Disarmament became* political movement for all nations with the general agreement The Treaty of Versailles was an attempt toward disarmament though it brought about disarmament only in a partial and unilateral manner Under the Peace Treaty, Germany was disarmed but other nations kept them selves buy in the race of armament

Types of Disarmament

1. Quantitative and Qualitative Disarmament Disarmament may be quantitative and qualitative It is qualitative when limitation is imposed on the use of certain types of weapons It is quantitative if restriction is imposed on all the types of instruments

2 General and Comprehensive Disarmament There is another distinction between the general disarmament and comprehensive disarmament General disarmament is that in which all or most of the great powers participate though not necessarily with a commitment to do way with all types of weapons Comprehensive disarmament embraces the control or prohibition of all armaments of all categories It is also called total disarmament

3. Disarmament under the Peace Treaties of 1919. During the First World War, the problem of armaments was largely identified with General militarism in Allied propaganda. The road to general disarmament was thought to be clear after the German military machine was overthorwn, and effective steps had been taken against German rearmament. This oversimplification of the issue found its way into the Peace Treaties of 1919. The Central powers were deprived of the more modern types of arms. They had to exchange conscription for small standing armies. The Council of Four added the following preamble to the military, naval and air terms of the Peace Treaty of Versailles as an after-thought, "In order to render possible the initiation of a general limitation of the armaments of all nations." Thus, a verbal link was established between German disarmament and the general limitations of armaments, which was to give rise to much controversy in the post-1919 period. Para IV of the Treaty of Versailles laid down: "The manufacture of arms, ammunitions or war-materials was limited and such manufacture should not be carried out in factories or workshops, the location of which should be communicated to and approved by the Government of the principal Allies." Treaty of the Versailles really envisaged the following on disarmament.

(i) Control over the manufacture of the war-materials,

(ii) Reduction in the strength of the Army and other steps.

The League Council was given the responsibility to formulate plans for reduction of armaments to ensure the enforcement by common action of international obligations, especially those undertaken under the League Covenant. These plans were to be submitted to each state for "consideration of action". Once adopted, the limits of the armaments fixed in these conventions were not to be exceeded without the Council's concurrence. These treaties were to be reconsidered and if necessary, revised every ten years at least.

Covenant of League of Nations contained explicit provisions dealing with disarmament under Arts. 8 and 9 in order to achieve world peace and international co-operation among nations.

German Withdrawal from Disarmament Conference.

In 1933 Germany formally withdrew from the Disarmament Conference. Germany broke one article after the other of the Disarmament Section of the Peace Treaty of Versailles. She set the pace for a rearmament race in which the other Powers joined with some hesitations. The fallacy of the limitation of armaments in isolation was exploded. A constructive alternative to the waste and psychological effects of unlimited armament race was beyond the grasp of a world rapidly moving towards the Second World War. Entire world became actively interested in the Nuclear Arms race including Europe after the close of the Second World War.

Nuclear Arms Race in Europe

The vital question of a joint European defence policy loomed large after it was clear that Britain will enter the European Economic Community (EEC) It was understood that Anglo-French cooperation could produce an exclusively European nuclear force There was already an extensive collaboration in the field of advanced military technology among France, Germany, Britain and other European countries It was however, confined to the sub-nuclear level with the production chiefly of aircraft Its military implications were less far-reaching than collaboration in nuclear weapons Following were the strategic arguments for the formation of such a European nuclear force

1 **More Bargaining Power.** By maintaining their own nuclear weapons they would gain more bargaining power in the use and targeting of American force

2. **British Position** Britain feared that political pressures in America may one day bring an end to the MacMohan Act under which Britain gained privileged access to U S military nuclear information Collaboration was seen as an alternative means of maintaining Britain's position in the field of nuclear technology

3 **French Position.** For France the question revolved round the credibility of the American nuclear guarantee Gaullists foresaw a future when no American President would be prepared to risk American lives for the sake of European cities and therefore France, and Europe must have its own nuclear force

Concluding Remarks

1 During the post-war period there was not only the problem of maintaining peace but there was an immediate problem of disarmament

2 Under the provisions of the Treaty of Versailles, the problem of armaments was largely identified with German militarism

3 The League of Nations adopted explicit provisions under Arts 8 and 9 of the Covenant for the purposes of achieving world peace and international co-operation

4 The League Council delegated the task of disarmament to a Preparatory Commission but it experienced a lot of difficulties in regard to control of the land forces and naval forces and limitation of expenditure on military preparation

5 In 1932 the World Disarmament Conference was held and the European powers took different stands

6 Germany formally withdrew from the World Disarmament Conference in 1933 and broke one article after the other of the Disarmament Sections of

the Peace Treaty of Versailles, and with German withdrawal rearmament race began in Europe.

7. World Powers with their armament-race began to move rapidly towards the Second World War and the Second World War broke out.

8. Even after the end of the Second World War, European Powers have been participating in Nuclear Arms Race.

QUESTIONS FOR EXERCISE

1. What was the Mandate System? Do you think this was an improvement upon the colonial practice of the century?
2. "The most interesting international efforts to deal effectively with the double problem of imperialism— that of protecting native states and that of keeping the people among the empire builders— are to be found in the Mandate System." (Schumann) Discuss.
3. Define disarmament and discuss its need.
4. "The letters of failure are written large over the portals of successive disarmament conferences during the two decades after Versailles." (Schumann) Elaborate.
5. Account for the failure of efforts at disarmament inside and outside the League of Nations during the inter-war period (1921-1936).
6. Describe in brief the different attempts made by different nations of the League of Nations for bringing about disarmament in post war period.
7. "The strategy of disarmament is the exact reverse of collective security system of the regional security alliances. Discuss.

19

Reparation, War Debts and Economic Depression

DEFINITION OF REPARATION

The practice of demanding reparation from the defeated powers for the losses involved during the war has been in vogue for a long time Such *reparations were demanded after the Napoleonic war*, the Franco-Russian war and the Russo-Japanese war Webster's dictionary defined the term 'reparations' as "compensation either in money or in materials, commodities, capital equipment, merchant vessels, and the like, payable by a defeated nation as war indemnity for direct damages and for loss from war expenditures, occupation costs, etc sustained as a result of aggression by the defeated nation"

HISTORY OF REPARATION

1. Treaty of Versailles The Treaty of Versailles demanded reparations from Germany on the basis of 'guilt-clause' Although Germany was held responsible for causing all the loss and damage to the Allied and Associated Governments, the Allied under the impact of the Wilson's declaration agreed to realise reparation only for the loss of the civilian and government property, and not the total cost of war Thus Germany was to pay reparation for (a) the loss of civilian property, (b) destruction of the merchant-men, (c) pension to the retired officials of the Allies However, an *exception was made in case of Belgium, who was required to pay all the* costs of the war

2. Reparation Commission The job of drawing up a bill and a *schedule of total reparation from Germany was entrusted to a* Reparation Commission which consisted of two member each from U S A, England, France and Italy and one ordinary members each from Belgium, Japan and Yugoslavia However, pending the Commission's report Germany was required to pay to the Allied Powers a sum of one million pounds The Commission was expected to make its report by 31st May, 1921

3. Spa Conference. In July, 1920 the Allies met at Spa, a place in Germany for the distribution of the realised amount of reparation among themselves as per Article 237 of the Treaty of Versailles. On July 16, 1920 the powers agreed to distribute the receipts in the following ratio: France 52%, British Empire 22%, Italy 10%, Japan 75%, Belgium 8%, Greece, Rumania, the Serb-Croat-Slovene State and other powers 5%, Portugal 0.75%.

Germany was invited to decide a lump sum for the settlement of Germany's reparation payment. The German Chancellor and Minister for Foreign Affairs met the leading Allied ministers round a table on terms of equality. No agreement could be reached about lump sum. On the plea of Germany's failure to complete the preliminary reparation payment, the Allied troops occupied the three towns of Susseldorf, Duisberg and Ruhrort on the east of Rhine.

4. The London Schedule. The Reparation Commission submitted its report in April, 1921 and fixed Germany's total liability at $660 millions plus interest. On this basis the Allied Supreme Council at London issued a schedule of payments. The German reparation payments were divided into three classes 'A', 'B' and 'C. The 'C' class bonds accounting for $4,000,000,000, which constituted approximately two-thirds of payments, were to be held by the Reparation Commission until such time as Germany's capacity to pay was established. For the rest of the amount Germany was to pay $100,000,000 annually plus 24% of the value of her exports. The Schedule was communicated to the German government with an ultimatum that failure to accept it by May 12 would be followed by the Allied occupation of the Ruhr. Germany conveyed acceptance of the Schedule on May 11, 1921 and the first instalment of $50 million was paid on August 31, 1921.

Meanwhile, Germany was in the throes of financial collapse. The war ravages, the loss of assets and drawing of wealth owing to payment of debts and the flight of capital due to the uncertainty resulted in the fall of mark's value. Thus Germany's capacity to pay the reparation charges, was completely exhausted. Unable to pay, according to the London Schedule, the German government, therefore, asked for a moratorium for three years. While Llyod George of England was willing to concede the request, Poincare of France refused to grant the concessions and allow Germany to evade payment.

5. The Ruhr Occupation. The French politicians were obsessed with the idea of 'French Security'. When the German deliveries of timber fell short of an agreed schedule, France insisted on the Reparation Commission to declare it a 'voluntary default' on the party of Germany. On December 26, 1922, the Reparation Commission declared Germany in voluntary default. As per terms of the Treaty of Versailles the Allied Powers had the right to take any step in case of voluntary default. On January 11, 1923 the French, Italian and Belgium troops occupied Ruhr and an International Commission was set up to carry on the administration.

The occupation of Ruhr proved to be a blunder for France because she not only lost one of her important allies—Britain, but also created all lasting bitterness in the minds of the German people towards France It was disastrous for Germany, because her economy collapsed when her most important industrial areas passed under foreign occupation Therefore, Germany started a passive resistance movement in Ruhr All reparation payments in the form of coal and iron were stopped The mines reduced their production of coal The people withheld payment of taxes and refused to the orders from the foreigners Nearly all communication services including telegraph, telephone and railway came to a standstill The French attempt to work the mines and factories themselves proved a failure Thus the occupation of Ruhr proved to be a costly proposition for France French heaved a sigh of relief when German government withdrew its resistance in 1923

6 **Dawes Plan** The passive resistance movement was called of by Germany in September, 1923 In view of the loss of industries, the currency crisis, internal movement in Rhineland and the fall of Cuno government in Germany, the new Chancellor of Germany, Stresemann sought of foreign help for the recovery of Germany Powers like U S A , Britain, Belgium, Italy and France came forward to rescue Germany from economic ruin The Reparation Commission appointed Dawes Committee consisting of the representatives of these countries under the Chairmanship of U S A 's representative General Charles G Dawes The Committee was expected to propose methods of balancing the German budget and settle her currency crisis It met in Paris from January 14 to April 9, 1924 and submitted the following recommendations

(i) *New Currency.* A new currency, the Reichsmark was introduced at the old parity The control of this new currency was handed over to a Central Bank of issue called the Reichsbank A board of seven Germans and seven foreigners was formed to supervise the Reichsbank, which controlled the issue of paper money and acted as a depository for reparation payments

(ii) *Payments* Germany was expected to pay fifty million pounds for the first five years This amount was to be later raised to a maximum of $125 million, depending on the index of her prosperity

(iii) *Sources* The reparations were to be paid from railway bonds, transport taxes, industrial debentures and proceeds of revenues of alcohol, tobacco, beer and sugar

(iv) *Foreign Agent-General.* He was appointed for reparation payments as well as the foreign commissions to execute the plan

(v) *Mode of payment* The payments were to be made in German currency and the operations of transfer were to rest with the creditors

(vi) ***Evacuation from the Ruhr.*** In order to restore Germany's economic sovereignty and to permit the new plan to operate without delay, Ruhr was to be evacuated.

(vii) ***Loan.*** A loan of £ 40,000,000 was to be given to Germany by the creditor nations to enable her to stabilise her currency and to pay her first instalment.

On July 16, 1924 the recommendations of the Dawes Committee were discussed at a Conference held in London. Britain and America tried to persuade France to accept the recommendations. Henceforth Germany could not be declared in default without the unanimous decision of the Reparation Commission.

The Dawes Plan was the first attempt to solve the reparation problem purely on economic basis. It provided a breathing spell to Germany by fixing the amounts of annual instalments and by arranging foreign loans for her. It resulted in general economic recovery of Germany. Both England and America henceforth began to invest their capital in Central Europe. The Allies were also assured of reparations. The Plan went a long way in removing tension that had existed in Europe since the signing of the Peace Treaties. It paved the way for 'Locarno Spirit' which created an atmosphere of peace and security.

However, the Dawes Plan suffered from serious drawbacks. Although it provided for annual payment of reparations by Germany, it failed to specify the time limit, and the total amount to be paid by Germany. The sum fixed by the Reparation Commission in 1921 was still in force. This crushed the German incentive to accumulate savings and improve her financial well-being because all her savings would merely enrich the foreigners. From 1924 to 1929, Germany was able to pay the reparations smoothly because she was able to secure huge loans from foreign countries specially U.S.A.

7. The Young Plan. The representatives of France, U.S.A., Britain and Germany met at Geneva and decided to call a Committee of experts to suggest a final settlement of the reparation problem. The Committee came to be known as 'Young Committee', after the name of its President Owen D. Young of U.S.A. It held its first meeting at Paris on February 11, 1929. It continued to work till June 7, 1929 when it finally submitted its Plan with the following provisions:

(i) The Young Plan considerably reduced the amount of German debt. It laid down that she would pay thirty-seven annual instalments of £100,000,000. Besides she was also required to pay a small war debt of the Allies to the Americans, in twenty-two annual instalments.

(ii) Controls established by the Dawes Plan were abolished.

(iii) The Young Plan imposed the responsibility of transfers on Germany.

(iv) The realisation and distribution of the amount of reparation was to be arranged through an international bank to be administered by a Board composed of the representatives of Germany and the creditor powers

(v) To save German currency against possible landslide and dislocation, provision was made for postponement of a part or whole of the rest of the annual payments for a period of two years

(vi) Allies were directed to evacuate the Rhineland by June 30, 1930

The Young Plan was accepted by the Hague Conference on January 20, 1930 consisting of the representatives of France, Italy, Japan, Great Britain and Germany Hague Conference also settled the question regarding payment of non-German reparations While Austria was completely exempted from reparation payments, Hungarian reparation payments were to be utilised for the relief of Hungarian occupants till 1943 Bulgaria was, however, to continue the payment of reparation

The Young Plan not only reduced but also fixed the German debts The establishment of the Bank of International Settlement and the progressive scale of annuities reduced the problem of payment and disbursement It reduced the uncertainly for both the debtors and creditors It separated the question of reparations from political and diplomatic questions

8. Depression and Hoover Moratorium. The Young Plan was put into operation in May, 1930 At this time the world was engulfed with a terrible economic depression, which stood in the way of Germany securing further foreign loans and balancing her budgets The foreign investors began to withdraw their capital and deposits from Germany The economic structure of Germany practically collapsed It was not possible for her to pay reparations The problem of unemployment made the situation explosive Hence German President Hidenburg appealed to President Hoover of U S A for moratorium President Hoover asked all states to suspend their mutual payments of reparation for one year from July 1931 Germany was asked not to utilise the money for military purposes Annuities were to be paid by Germany to the Bank of International Settlement, which was to buy German railway bonds and to have the railway turn the money over to the German Government, so that the latter may use the money for economic purposes

9. End of Reparation. In 1932, the Bank of International Settlement declared that it would be impossible for Germany to pay her reparations The representatives of Britain, France, Belgium, Italy, Japan and Germany met at Lausanne on June 1932 They offered to reduce the remaining German liability to an almost invisible figure and also to cancel their war debts to each other provided the U S A agreed to a cancellation of all debts owned to her Germany was given the option to make a total payment of £150,000,000 in the form of five per cent redeemable bonds It was a desperate attempt

on the part of these powers to save their own countries from economic ruin. As Germany was neither in position nor willing to pay anything, the reparation payments automatically came to an end. On similar grounds the debtors of America also refused to make full payments to U.S.A. However, all of them, with the exception of Finland which kept on paying her instalment in full, agreed to make token payments. Subsequently even these token payments were also stopped.

With the rise of Hitler in Germany in 1933 the chapter of reparation was closed. He officially repudiated the reparation pledges. To quote E.H. Carr, "The year 1932 saw the last act in that confused drama of reparation and inter-Allies debts which had tormented the world for more than ten years. The Lausanne Conference buried them both in the same unhonoured grave."

ECONOMIC CRISIS OF 1929

Causes of Crisis

After 1929 an economic crisis engulfed the whole of the world for about a decade. It brought untold suffering to the millions. Usually, the following causes are considered responsible for this crisis.

1. **Dislocation of international trade and of national economics.** It had resulted in a rush for raw materials, leading to the production of more goods than could be profitably absorbed. The problem was further made acute by the rise in the unemployment figures which was the direct outcome of rationalization of industries and the loss of their purchasing power. In order to protect their indigenous industries industrially underdeveloped countries raised high tariffs, resulting in piling up of industrial products in the developed countries.

2. **Unprecedented agricultural production.** As a result the prices of wheat came down to the lowest level in about 500 years. Even countries like Australia, New Zealand and Argentina, produced more wheat than they could consume. Though needed agricultural commodities the underdeveloped countries could not import the same on account of their exceedingly low purchasing powers.

3. **Mal-distribution of gold.** This was caused by debtor states paying their debts to America in gold. It led to its shortage in most of the countries and resulted in its abnormal flow to the U.S.A. As a result the prices of commodities fell and almost all the European states stopped the export of gold.

4. **Rise of Communism in Russia.** This led to cancellation of the debts of late Czarist government. It caused economic loss to the European states, which further contributed to economic depression.

Results of Crisis

1 **Blow to Currency system.** As a result of mal-distribution of gold in the world, England stopped the export of gold and abandoned the gold standard She was soon followed by about 40 states This hit hard the currency system of the world

2 **Abandonment of the policy of free trade and adoption of high tariffs all round** England passed the Industrial Protection Act, to protect her own industries against these countries which had artificially increased the volume of their export by devaluing their currency

3. **Emergence of Nazi Party.** The economic depression caused social unrest in Germany It paved the way for the emergence of Nazi Party under the leadership of Hitler The Nazi Party had been a bitter critic of the Peace Settlement It was opposed to payment of reparations imposed on Germany The economic crisis testified the apprehensions of the Nazi Party It paved the way for the return of destructive forces of Nazi regime

4. **Blow to Capitalism.** The depression gave a rude shock to capitalism and in its place socialistic ideas gained currency Hence sometimes the years between 1930 to 1939 are described as 'the pink decade' In contrast to the depression in the capitalist countries the Soviet Union continued to make progress in the economic field This prompted the people of the capitalist countries also to appeal to their governments to tide the depression and to stimulate recovery The New Deal of Roosevelt in America and the economic nationalism of Great Britain introduced state control

5 **Isolation of U.S.A.** The economic depression was also responsible for ' ıg U S A from the international politics after 1930

6. **Impact of Japan** In the Far East, the economic crisis reduced the Japanese foreign trade to half and contributed to unrest in domestic politics Compelled by the need for economic expansion she decided to embark upon a policy of conquest Her attack of Manchuria in 1931 created a breach in the system of collective security As Prof Toynbee said, "Racked by the remorseless *turning of the economic screw in the long-drawn-out course of the world depres*-sion, the Japanese people at last followed the lead of the Japanese army in reversing from the policy of commercial expansion to the policy of military conquest"

7. **Impact on France** In France the economic crisis led to instability of the government and resulted in Ministerial crisis The value of the French currency fell down considerably Thus in spite of British and U S assistance, France was not able to escape the economic crisis and its consequent impact

8. **Impact of Italy.** In Italy the economic crisis created many domestic problems which could not be successfully tackled This gave rise to the Fascist

movement. It encouraged the government to follow an imperialistic policy to divert the attention of the public from domestic problems.

9. Impact on League of Nations. The economic crisis indirectly paralysed the League of Nations, by creating problems which could not be solved by it and ultimately sounded its death-knell. The Far Eastern crisis of 1931, the Italian rape of Ethiopia in 1935, the brutal murder of the Spanish Republic by Germany and Italy were some of the problems which the League failed to solve.

10. Policy of Appeasement. The policy of appeasement followed by England, France and U.S.A. towards Germany, Italy and Japan during the years 1933 to 1939 was also an indirect outcome of the economic crisis. During this period these powers concentrated more attention to their economic problems and neglected the international sphere.

Thus, the Economic Crisis of 1929, had far-reaching political implications.

QUESTIONS FOR EXERCISE

1. Define the term "reparation" and trace out its history in brief.
2. "Reparation was a concession of no practical consequences, it was a vain attempt to make Germany pay". Comment.
3 "All this (that is the story of the reparation debts) is a sad story of complicated idiocy in the making of which toil and virtue was consumed." (Churchill) Discuss.
4. Write critical note on the Economic Crisis of 1929.

20

Italy and Rise of Fascism

ITALY'S HUMILIATION AFTER WORLD WAR I

During World War I Italy fought on the side of the victorious Allies She emerged from the war a defeated nation. She was not happy at the peace settlement She was not given what had been promised to her by the treaty of London Allies decided to favour Yugoslavia to the entire discontent of Italy She failed to secure anything tangible at the Paris Peace Conference As a result, Italy felt dissatisfied, disappointed and considerably wounded in her self-esteem Prof J Hampden Jakson has said, "Italian's felt themselves disgraced in the eyes of the world, swindled by their own politicians War had cost Italy dear, draining her of money, saddling her with a budget deficit of over twelve thousand million lire, facing up the cost of living This political party in power in 1919 was pacifist, its leaders old and cynical It is little wonder that Italians turned to violence" As Shumann put it, "From he longer perspective of times past and times to come. Italy was doomed to remain a lesser power with no independence of action unless the coalition of West should dissolve into a new multi-power constellation in which free maneuvering and bargaining would again become possible for every sovereignty whose such part might be valued, or enemity might by feared by others"

RISE OF FASCISM IN ITALY

In the post-war period Italian government was faced with problems *beyond its capacity to solve Demobilization had increased the army of* unemployed The country faced bankruptcy, starvation and inflation Strikes, lock-outs and riots of the hungry people were seen everywhere The cost of living rose very high National currency fell steadily Between 1919 and 1922, as many as six governments, were formed in Italy This gave rise to Fascism Gathrone Hardy has remarked that "the circumstances under which Fascism developed in Italy, though in a sense peculiar to that country, confirmed the thesis that this form of autocracy is the product of situation when democratic sentiment proves incompatible with effective parliamentary government"

Mussolini exploited the rising discontent in the country form the Fascist party. He invited all the anti-government people to join the revolution. Failing to capture power through elections Mussolini ordered his followers to march to Rome. In late October, 1922 which terrified the King who appointed Mussolini the Premier of Italy, in a constitutional manner.

Now soon Mussolini embarked upon a ruthless policy of suppression of opposition parties, abolition of freedom of press, suspended local autonomous units and democratic institutions. The election laws were modified in favour of Fascist Party. The Chapter of Deputies was dissolved and a Council of 22 was set up. Thus Mussolini established dictatorship of Fascist Party in Italy.

MUSSOLINI'S FOREIGN POLICY

Need of Aggressive Foreign Policy

Mussolini followed a forward foreign policy. This policy was necessary to raise the prestige of Italy in the eyes of other powers. Mussolini's Foreign Policy aimed at demonstrating to the world that Italy had enough strength, not only to protect herself, but also to attain the lands she had been promised by the London Treaty in 1915. An aggressive foreign policy was also helpful in diverting the attention of the people from domestic politics. Italy needed colonies to provide an outlet to the "hundreds of thousands of her children deprived of work in the fatherland and no longer enabled to emigrate abroad on account of limitations imposed on immigration by foreign countries. Mussolini openly declared "We are hungry for land, because we are prolific and intend to remain so". By establishing a Mediterranean and African Empire, Italy was also keen to regain her Roman inheritance.

Objectives of Foreign Policy

Depicting the objectives of Italy's foreign policy Kacharine Duff wrote, "As things were the Mediterranean far from being her empire, was her prison; Corisca, Malta, Tunis and Cyprus formed that prison's bars while Gibraltar and Seuz guarded its gates and Greece, Turkey and Egypts were ready to complete the chain encircling her. Determined first to break her prison bars, and then to march to the Ocean without access to which she must be considered only half-independent Italy might push towards the Indian ocean by linking Libya with Ethopia through the Sudan towards the atlantic through French North Africa." Thus Italy was keen to have control in South-eastern Europe, Africa and, even further ahead.

Steps in Foreign Policy

South-Eastern Europe. By the Treaty of Laussane (1923) Italy got back the Dodacanese Islands, which she had surrendered to Greece in 1920. Italian

army bombed the island of Corfu and occupied it Greece lodged a protest with the League of Nations The League intervened and after receiving compensation from Greece and Italy left Corfu This increased the prestige of Mussolini at home In January 1924 Italy concluded Treaty of Rome with Yugoslavia by which the city of Fiume proper went to Italy, Yugoslavia got the neighbouring town of Porto Baros

Mussolini conclude a treaty with Albania Tirana, in 1926, by which Albania became a dependency of Italy In 1939 he annexed Albania to Italy. In 1928 Italy was invited to participate in the administration of the Free city of Tangler on the West Coast of Morocco This was a great diplomatic triumph for Mussolini At the London Naval Conference in 1930, Mussolini demanded naval parity with France In 1931, he asked for the revision of the peace treaties

These steps enabled Mussolini to strengthen Italy's hold on the Adriatic, to increase her prestige in the Mediterranean, and to extend her diplomatic and commercial influence in the South Eastern Europe

Seizure of Abyssinia

Abyssinia was next target of the expansionists policy of Mussolini He was prompted to undertake this project because (1) Italy needed some territory for her surplus population, (2) She needed raw materials for her industries and markets for her finished products, (3) Mussolini wanted to distract the attention of Italian people from their miserable economic conditions, (4) Abyssinia was of strategic value to Italians It could link the Italian possessions in Somaliland and, Eriteria and South East Africa, (5) Finally, a war against Abyssinia could arouse patriotic spirit of the Italians who had suffered a defeat at the hands of Abyssinia in 1896

Mussolini had nourished designs against Abyssinia for a long time but he did not actually undertake this project unless he was sure of a military victory By the attitude of League of Nations and other Great powers towards conquest of Manchuria by Japan, Mussolini was convinced that in spite of the principle of collective security, nobody was going to check them from conquering Abyssinia Further, the statesman of Europe were preoccupied with their domestic problems due to the economic depression In the international sphere they were engaged with the problem of Hitler's rise to power and his aggressive policy

In October 1935 the Italian troops invaded Abyssinia The Council of the League of Nations declared that Italy had "resorted to war in disregard of its obligations under Article 12 of the Covenant" The League Assembly recommended the appointment of a Committee to co-ordinate the work She asked the members of the League to stop all loans or credits to Italy and place an embargo on her exports However, France was not happy about these

economic sanctions, fearing that it might plunge the whole of Europe into a war. Ultimately in May 1936, the Italian forces occupied Abyssinia.

Commenting on the significance of Italians seizure of Abyssinia, Gathorne Hardy pointed out that it "marks a crucial turning point in post-war history. The triumph of Italian aggression, naked and unashamed, affected the whole world with fundamental consequences. To England it meant the virtual destruction of the institution which successive Governments of different parties had proclaimed to be the keystone of their foreign policy. To France, it meant that the enemy, whom she was encouraged to act arbitrarily and feared most freed from his previous isolation. And finally, to the Italian transgression by an act of poetic justice, it was destined to mean the extinction of his influence on the Danube and the arrival of German forces on the Brenner."

Opposition of Austria-German Unity

Mussolini opposed the Union of Austria with Germany during the inter-war period, because it was likely to put a stop to the Italian influence in Europe. In 1931, he opposed the tarrif union between Austria and Germany. In 1934, Mussolini ordered Italian mobilization, to help the Nazis revolt in Austria and fatally wound the Austrian Chancellor Dollfuss. Thus Austria was saved from German annexation.

Policy in South East Europe

In South-Eastern Europe Italy tried to impress on the states of the region to form alliances with Italy rather than France. The lesser states of the region were eager to make alliance either with France or with Italy but were not ready to accept the supremacy of either. Italy outwitted France by forming alliance with both Yogoslavia and Czechoslovakia. France could not have an alliance with Czechoslovakia but was able to increase her influence over the states in the region. By the dissolution of the Little Entente and substituting it with a combination directed from Rome. Italy made efforts to destroy French political influence. But since she could not have a monopoly of these alliances she encouraged Germany against France. Italy supported Germany's stand of 'parity between German and French strength' in the matter of disarmament, as it could give the Italian army a balance of power on the continent. When Germany rearmed herself to the French level, Italy was able to defy Great Britain in the Abyssinian war. In spite of being keen to secure German co-operation Italy's stand on Austria against Germany made it impossible for the two to come close for the time being.

On January 7, 1935, Italy signed a pact with France at Rome. In return for concessions by Italy in Central and Eastern Europe, France conceded the main demands of Italy in Africa. Italy was given 44,500 sq. miles of territory bordering on the Anglo-Egyptian Sudan along with of French Somaliland giving

Eritrea an outlet to the Gulf of Aden The two parties were to respect their mutual frontiers and abstain from meddling in each others internal affairs Both the parties agreed to oppose any unilateral revision of the Treaty of Versailles particularly in respect of German re armament The friendly relations suffered a set back

Since France participated in the economic sanctions enforced against Italy due to her intervention in Abyssinia

Relationship with Britain

Italy started improving her relations with Britain after the rise of Hitler, as Great Britain was a great naval power of Europe and had influence in the Mediterranean sea Italy had aligned herself with France and Great Britain at the Stress Conference Great Britain and Italy issued a declaration in January 1937 *that they had agreed to preserve the status quo in the Mediterranean On* April 1938 another agreement was concluded by the two countries by which they agreed to a number of issues arising out of Italy's conquest of Abyssinia and *status quo* in the Mediterranean and the Near Eastern area Italy, however, agreed to withdraw a substantial number of her volunteers from Spain England recognised Italy's African Empire Chamberlain and Halifax went to Rome in 1939, but the mission did not yield much

In 1939, Britain made another effort to win over Italy On April 16, 1939, both the parties agreed to stop mutually hostile propaganda, to maintain *status quo* in the Mediterranean and to give some concessions in Lake Tsana for Britain Though she agreed to withdraw volunteers from Spain, Italy did not comply with any of the terms of the settlement. However, the agreement enhanced Italy's prestige, which had sunk low after Hitler's annexation of Austria

By philosophy and attitude Mussolini was more close to Germany While his attitude towards Great Britain and France was one of hesitation and reserve, his friendship with Germany was smooth and steady In 1937 Italy joined the anti Comintern Pact concluded by Germany and Japan in 1936 Hitler referred to this Berlin Rome-Tokyo Axis a "a great world political triangle," which "consists not of three powerless images but of free states which are prepared and determined to protect decisively their rights and vital interests" In March, 1938 Hitler occupied Austria Though Mussolini had assumed the self-imposed role of protector of Austria in July, 1934, he could not do anything due to Italy's estrangement with the western democracies after the Abyssinian affair He made a bad job of the issue by telling Hitler that Austria did not interest him at all Thus in spite of earning the gratitude of Hitler Mussolini lost his cherished dream of following an independent policy and establishing protectorate over Austria

Role in World War II

Italy remained neutral when the Second World War started in September 1939. She planned to attack when the Allies were almost exhausted. That could save Italy from the destruction of war and entitle her to share in the spoils of the victory. On June 10,1940, when France was on the verge of collapse, Italy declared war against Britain and France. She formally joined the Triple Alliance with Germany and Japan on September 27, 1940. She declared war against Soviet Russia in December 1941 and against U.S.A. in June 1941. The course of the war began to change after 1942. Fall of Mussolini and Italy became imminent. The Allies attacked Sicily on July 1943. The king immediately ordered for the arrest of Mussolini, though a little later the German army freed him and put him back into power. But in 1945, when the Allies attacked North Italy, she surrendered to the Allies. This marked the end of Fascist Italy.

QUESTIONS FOR EXERCISE

1. Discuss the Role of Italy in International relation during 1920-1945.
2. "The tendency of the Little Entente powers was to encourage a competition for their friendship of which Italy desired a monopoly" (Gatherne Hardy). What were the basic objectives of Italian Policy in Europe ? How did Italy try to achieve them.
3. "Really speaking Fascism of Italy and Nazism of Germany were the two sides of the coin. Both were the eyesore of Communism and Soviet Russia". Comment.

21

Rise of Nazism in Germany

WEIMER CONSTITUTION

The collapse of Germany in the First World War led to political turmoils in the country Kaiser William II was held responsible for the reverses of the German army and the miseries of the people, compelled by a country-wide anti-monarchist revolution to abdicate the throne, and shelter in Holand along with his family Now a parliamentary democracy was established in Germany The Democratic National Assembly was entrusted with the responsibility of drafting a democratic constitution for German Republic which came into effect on August 11,1919 and was known as "Weimer Constitution" The Weimer Republic had a number of outstanding achievements to its credit By the introduction of the Dawes plan in 1924, Germany witnessed unprecedented prosperity Industrial production recorded an enormous increase The huge amounts advanced by the foreign countries to Germany enabled her to re-establish the currency The rationalisation of the German industrial and business life prevented ruinous competition The establishment of branches of foreign firms in Germany led to the utilisation of German raw materials and provided employment to the German labour

GERMAN FOREIGN POLICY

During this period, Germany pursued three aims in the sphere of foreign policy (1) to induce the Allies to evacuate those areas of Germany which they had occupied, (2) to restore the sovereignty of the *Reich* and recovery of Danzig and correction of the frontier in Upper Silesia, (3) settlement of the reparation problems as per Germany's capacity Germany wanted to make her own decisions through these aims She signed the Locarno treaties, by which her frontiers with France were settled In 1922 she concluded the Treaty of Rapallo with Soviet Union by which both the states renounced their respective demand against each other and agreed to cooperate in the commercial sphere In 1926, Germany was admitted to the League of Nations with a semi-permanent seat in the Council In 1924 she succeeded in getting a promise of withdrawal of foreign troops from the Ruhr and then in 1930 the valley was freed and Britain, France and Belgium agreed to withdraw their troops from the Rhineland

region. The Young Plan largely settled the problem of reparation. In June 1932, the Lausanne Conference further cut down Germany's obligations of reparation to $ 750 million. Even this amount was not actually paid. After the economic and diplomatic revival, Germany began to rearm herself. She started equipping her army with new weapons and anti-tank defence.

NAZISM OR RISE OF HITLER

In early 1933, the affairs of Germany passed under Hitler. The leader of the Nazi movement in Germany Adolf Hitler was an Austrian citizen. He began his career as a political agitator after the war. He joined the German Workers Party in 1920. It later came to be known as the National Socialist German Workers' Party popularly known as Nazi Party. Soon he succeeded Drexter, the leader of the party and assumed supreme power which brought him in clash with the authorities. During his trial he said, "There is no such thing as high treason against the traitors of 1918," this remark attracted much attention. He was awarded five years imprisonment, but was released after nine months. During his imprisonment Hitler wrote *'Mein Kampf'* in which he repudiated the parliamentary practice of majority rule and laid down the future programme of Germany's territorial ambitions.

The Nazi party was proscribed and its disintegration set in after the imprisonment of Hitler. The number of its supporters considerably fell down in the election of 1924. After the reorganisation of the Nazi party, its popularity increased in 1925. In the election of 1932 the Nazi Party captured 230 out of 608 seats in the Riechstag. As Hitler was restless to capture power, he contested the Presidential elections in 1932. He lost to Hindenburg by a narrow margin. In 1933 Hindenburg dismissed the former Chancellor Schleicher and appointed Hitler as Chancellor. In March 5, 1933 Hitler dissolved the Reichstag and ordered election. Six days before the election the Reichstag building was burnt. Hitler accused the Communists of arson and bloody revolution and ordered the arrest Communists and Social Democrats. He suppressed the campaign activities of the anti-Nazi parties. However, Nazi party could secure only forty-four per cent of the votes polled. Hitler soon managed majority in the Reichstag by putting all the Communist Deputies behind the bars. All opposition was suppressed within three months. In August 1934 Hindenburg died. Now Hitler himself became the President of Germany. He got dictatorial powers by "The Enabling Act".

FACTORS FOR THE GROWTH OF NAZISM OR RISE OF HITLER

Hitler was comparatively unknown till 1929. In 1934 he emerged as the unchallenged leader of Germany. The following factors contributed towards the rise of Hitler to power.

1. Treaty of Versailles. The major factor which Hitler exploited to win popular support was the humiliating treatment meted out to Germany by the

Peace Settlement of 1919 As Dr Langsam says, "The continuing hostile attitude of France, the quarrels over the Ruhr, the Rhineland occupation, the Saar and the reparation, the wrangling over disarmament all these fed the anger of many Germans"

2. Danger of Communism Hitler also exploited the success of the Bolsheviks in Russia and the growing strength of Communists in Germany The Communists had 77 members in the Reichstag in 1930 They were able to increase their strength the first and second elections of 1932 to 89 and 100 respectively As the Germans were much afraid of Communists, the Nazis raised the slogan "If the National Socialist Party collapses there will be another ten million Communists in Germany" Afraid of Bolshevik ideals a large number of industrialists and wealthy people also helped the Nazi Party Schuman writes, "Industrialists and Junkers subsidized the brown shirt Nazi storm troopers hoping to make use of them against communists, socialists, the trade unions and other threats real or imaginary to prosperity and privilege"

3. The Economic Crisis The Nazi party fully exploited the economic crisis in post-war Germany Due to inflation the condition of the farmers and shopkeepers was desperate Mass unemployment had reduced the purchasing power of the urban population The condition of agriculture was no better The National Socialists made lavish promises to the peasants and small tradesmen The National Socialists-like Italian Fascists, promised heaven to all Fortunately, when the Nazis came to power the world began to recover from the economic blizzard Lipson rightly says, "If their summons to office had been delayed by a few months the decline in popular support evinced in the general election of 1932, would probably have greatly accelerated"

4 Resurgence of Militant German Nationalism. By nature and temperament Germans have a weakness for prestige and glory They are always in the look-out of a 'strong man' who could bring peace and prosperity to them They wanted a strong man to check the expansion of communism, which was winning millions of discontented workers into its ranks When they found such a man in Hitler, they welcomed him with open arms

5. Leadership of Adolf Hitler. The Personality of Hitler was one of the major factors in the rise of Nazism In the words of Benns, Hitler was "an adept psychologist, a clever damagogue and a master showman, he was a resourceful agitator, a tireless worker and an able organiser" He was convinced that a political revolution must be preceded by a psychological revolution Through his Mein Kampf, Hitler tried to create a psychological revolution The mentally prepared the young Germans to avenge the wrong done to them by the victors of 1918

6. Anti Semitic Propaganda. The Nazi rise helped in the anti-Semitic propaganda The Nazis pleaded that the Jews who formed the wealthier sections of the German society belonged to a different race and as such were

foreigners. Thus they succeeded in creating a feeling among the Germans that their hardships were due to the Jews.

7. Lack of unity among Opposition Parties. The opposition parties, which lacked unity, failed to pose any check to the authority of the Nazis Hitler came to power through constitutional machinery. He fully exploited the desire of the German people to secure for themselves a place in the sun.

PROGRAMME OF NAZI PARTY

The principles of Hitler's foreign policy were laid down in the Nazi Programme of the National Socialist German Workers' Union later known as Nazi Party, and Hitler's *Mein Kampf.* In its three-point programme of foreign policy. The National Socialist German Workers' Union had laid down its objectives as (1) the Union of all people of German race by the right of self-determination in one great Germany; (2) The cancellation of the Peace Treaties of Versailles and St. Germain; and (3) Acquisition of further territory for the support of the people and the settlement of the surplus German population.

Principles in Mein Kampf

In *Mein Kampf* Hitler emphasised the following principles of German foreign policy. He wrote: "The German frontiers are the outcome of a chance and are only temporary frontiers that have been established as the result of political struggles which took place at various times .....State frontiers are established by human beings and may be changed by human beings. The winning back of the lost territories of a country is, in the first place, the question of winning back the political independence and power of the mother country. To make this possible and to secure it through an adroit policy of alliance is the first task for a vigorous direction of our foreign policy." He pleaded for putting a final stop to "the colonial and trade policy of pre-war times and pass over to the territorial policy of the future. But when we speak of new territory in Europe today, we must principally think of Russia and the border states subject to her. Today, there are eighty million Germans in Europe and our foreign policy will be recognised as rightly conducted only when, after barely a hundred years, there will be 250 million Germans living on this Continent, not packed together as coolies in the factories of another continent but as tillers of the soil and workers whose labour will be a national assurance for their existence."

Giving reasons for acquisition of greater living space Hitler wrote : "Germany within her existing frontiers could attain only a very limited self-sufficiency in raw materials and none at all in food-stuffs. The only remedy lay in the acquisition of greater living space ...If then, we accept the security of our food situation as the principal question, the space necessary to insure it can only be sought in Europe, not, as in the liberal view, in the exploitation of colonies. It is not a matter of acquiring population but of gaining space for agricultural use. Moreover, areas producing raw material can

be more usefully sought in Europe in immediate proximity to the Reich than overseas"

Hitler wrote "If we speak today of new territory in Europe, we can *primarily think only of Russia and the border states If the Urals with their* immeasurable wealth of raw materials, Siberia with its rich forests, and the Ukraine with its limitless cornfields lay within Germany, this country under National Socialist Leadership would swim in plenty We would produce so much that every single German would have more than enough to live on"

Aims of Foreign Policy

From the above observations of Hitler, It is obvious that Germany aimed to expand in the South and East of Europe, Because that region alone could give more space or elbow room to the German population This region was economically complementary to Germany It possessed huge stocks of coal, oil and wheat which Germany required badly As the region was divided into a number of small states, none of the states could profitably exploit the natural resources of the area Austria had coal but no grain Hungary had grain but no factories Romania had ores and invaluable oil but no markets The best results could be achieved only if one political power could establish hegemony over the whole region With its industrial techniques, and its factories crying for raw material and markets, Germany was most fit to assume this *responsibility*

Aggressive Foreign Policy

About the methods to be observed for the fulfilment of the objectives of German foreign policy, Hitler said, "Reliance on force and the rejection of compromise *should be the keystone*" New party preferred to take rather than receive to tear up treaties by a unilateral repudiation of its obligations rather than to modify them by amicable negotiations, to spring its measures suddenly upon the world without any warning, and to keep the nerves of Europe on edge by creating an atmosphere of tensions As Bullock has observed, "Hitler had only one programme, Power, first his own power in Germany and then the expansion of German power in Europe The restwas window dressing"

But the pursuit of such an aggressive policy would have created troubles for Germany by uniting all enemies of Germany Sensing this difficulty Hitler declared diplomatically, "The German Government and the German people are united in the will to pursue a policy of peace, reconciliation and understanding, as the foundation of all decisions and all negotiations" *He stopped condemnation of the Versailles Treaty* but directed his hostility against Bolshevism This move proved helpful to Germany, U S A, France and Britain took no immediate steps against Germany

Withdrawal from the League

Hitler sought to reduce the Treaty of Versailles to a scrap of paper. He was convinced that the League stood for perpetuation of the political settlement of 1919. It was the greatest hindrance in the way of achieving his objectives. He took the first step in this direction by withdrawing from the League of Nations in October 1933. After this withdrawal Germany was relieved of all the international obligations imposed by the Covenant.

Polish German Non-aggression Pact (January 1934)

In January 1934, Hitler concluded a Non-aggression Pact with Poland for 10 years, to show Germany's peaceful intentions. He realised that if Germany wanted to advance outward, she must make peace with her eastern neighbours. Soviet Union could not be won over due to the prosecution of the Jews and Communists in Germany, Czechoslovakia was too small a country, Poland was the natural choice. At that time Poland was feeling distrustful of her ally France. France had subordinated the Polish interests to her own security during the Locarno Pact of 1925. Poland also felt that a treaty with Germany would silence the German minorities, who had been a source of headache for her since 1919.

Recovery of Saar (March 1935)

The Treaty of Versailles had vested France with the right to occupy and exploit the Saar for a period of 15 years. After the lapse of this period, the people of Saar were to decide through a plebiscite to be held under the auspices of the League of Nations. The plebiscite was arranged in 1935 whether they would like to go back to Germany or not and 90% of the voters voted in favour of Germany. On march 1,1935 the territory of Saar was united with Germany.

Austro-German Agreement (July 1936)

After the conclusion of World War I, Germany wanted to have a union with Austria. Her effort to venture a customs union between Germany and Austria was foiled in 1931 due to intervention of the western powers. After assuming power in Germany Hitler made it chief aim of his foreign policy to complete the union with Austria. He encouraged the subversive elements in Austria to bring about the fall of Austrian Chancellor Dollfuss, who was opposed to it. Dollfuss was killed by the terrorists. On July 25, 1934 this created great stir in Austria. Mussolini sent Italian troops to help the Austrian Government. Hitler did not intervene in the Austrian affairs. Two years later a pact was signed by which Germany agreed to respect the Austrian independence and reopened German trade and travel with Vienna. But as Hitler was bent upon annexation of Austria, he befriended Italy and ultimately annexed Austria in 1938. The western powers remained silent spectators. It has been well said that like sincere widows, they moaned and shouted but otherwise did nothing.

Accord with Italy (October 1936)

Hitler knew that a war could not be successfully fought without allies Since France and Soviet Union could not be befriended and Great Britain, could not be relied upon Hitler, looked towards Italy Italy's thrust into Ethiopia in 1934-36 strained the relation of Italy to France, Great Britain and Russia Therefore, Mussolini saw only way out in German friendship Both of them wanted to undo the Peace Settlement of 1919 During the Spanish civil war when Mussolini was sending men and munitions to General Franco, Hitler supported Mussolini and won him over The two countries concluded an agreement for mutual cooperation in October, 1936 Thus was created *'Rome-Berlim Axis'*

Berlin-Rome-Tokyo Axis

In 1936, Germany entered into an Anti Comintern Pact with Japan Both the parties agreed to inform each other regarding the activities of the Comintern and to consult each other regarding the measures to combat their activities In November 1937, Italy also joined the anti-Comintern Pact Thus created the famous *Berlin-Rome Tokyo Axis*

Remilitarization of Germany

Hitler also took up the work of rearming Germany When Germany withdrew from the League of Nations, she also withdrew from the Disarmament Conference being held at Geneva Germany told the world in March, 1935 that a German Air Force was in existence, in complete violation of the treaty of Versailles On March 16,1935 Germany announced the Law for the Reconstruction of National Defence Forces In March, 1936, Hitler took the next step in the direction of rearmament when he sent his troops to remilitarize Rhineland, in violation of the freely negotiated treaty of Locarno

Intervention in Spanish Civil War

Following rebellion by General Franco a civil war broke out in Spain While Soviet Union helped the Government of Spain, Hitler and Mussolini helped General Franco General Franco was able to overthrow the Republican Government as a result of this help Through their policy of neutrality, Great Britain and France helped Hitler and Mussolini The Spanish civil war like the Ethiopian crisis, brought Italy and Germany closer to each other

Attack of Czechoslovakia

The Treaty of Versailles created the state of Czechoslovakia, but certain German minorities continued to have their affinity for Germany in spite of nice treatment by the Czechoslovakia government This minority raised a slogan that they should be allowed to join their motherland-Germany Taking advantage of this appeal Hitler intervened

Following were the causes for Hitler's interest in Czechoslovakia (1) Czechoslovakia belonged to the anti-revisionist group consisting of France and Russia (2) She was a strong supporter of the League of Nations

(3) Czechoslovakia had strategic importance since she retarded the expansion of Germany to the south. Occupation of Czechoslovakia meant occupation of the land through which the Germans could march against Russia. There Germany started instigating the German minority in Czechoslovakia (the Sudetan-Germans) to launch a violent struggle. On September 10, 1938 the Sudetan-Germans rose into an armed revolt. Germany started mobilisation of her forces and threatened to go to war. Hitler entered into a pact with Italy and japan. The British government proposed a peaceful settlement of Czechoslovakia crises. The French and of the British advised the Czech government to transfer the Sudetan area to Germany to which she immediately agreed. Hitler insisted that the transfer of the territory must be effected before October 1, 1938. Mussolini, however, advised Hitler to settle things amicably.

Munich Pact

On September 29, 1938 a Conference was held at Munich. It was attended by Great Britain, Italy, France and Germany. Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia were not represented in this Conference. A pact popular as *Munich Pact* was signed on September 30, 1938 after a good deal of discussion. It stated, "Germany, the United Kingdom, France and Italy taking into consideration the agreement which has been already reached in principle for cession to Germany of the Sudetan Germans territory, have agreed on the following terms and conditions governing the cession and measures, consequent thereon and by this agreement they each themselves held responsible for the steps necessary to secure its fulfilment." Under Munich Pact the evacuation was to start on 1st October, and to be completed by the 10th of October, without any existing installations being destroyed. The occupation of the predominantly German territory by German troops was to begin on 1st and be completed by 10th October, Czech government had to release the Sudetan-Germans from her military and policy force within four weeks. To determine the territories in which a plebiscite was to be held, a five-power Commission was set up. Till then the territories were to remain under an international force.

Munich Pact was a clever act of diplomacy on the part of Hitler who duped Chamberlain by giving him an assurance that he would follow a policy of peace if his demand of Czechoslovakia was met.

DISMEMBERMENT OF CZECHOSLOVAKIA

After the claim of the German minorities was established, Poland and Hungary also came out with their respective claims. Poland demanded 'Teschen' an area which had some ethnic affinity with Poland. Hungary demanded an area inhabited by the Magyars. Both these countries ultimately succeeded in getting these areas. Now Czechoslovakia remained only a thin strip of land.

At the instance of Hitler, Slovakia and Ruthenia declared their independence from the Czech government In March 14,1939 Hitler invited Dr Hacha to Berlin and forced him to sign the document by which Czechoslovakia was placed under the protectorate of Germany The Nazi troops occupied Czechoslovakia on March 18, 1939

As both the camps were making fervent preparations, War was now inevitable But Hitler felt that an understanding with U S S.R. was essential before the next major turn of events took place After the Munich Pact, Soviet Union was completely disgusted with the Western powers Therefore, Hitler concluded a non-aggression pact with Soviet Union on August 23,1939 This pact was a *masterpiece of Hitler's diplomacy* Through it Hitler was able to immunize Germany against a possible attack by the Soviet Union in case of German attack on Poland

Meanwhile Hitler had annexed Memel and demanded the Polish Corridor Hitler attacked Poland on September 1, 1939 and the second world war started

Impact of Rise of Hitler or Nazism

The rise of Hitler in Germany and the various measures he adopted to make Germany a totalitarian state created mixed reactions In England and United States there was a feeling of indignation, not of fear, and there was no marked change in their policy towards Germany In other countries there was a feeling of profound anxiety at Hitler's open challenge to the peace *settlement of 1919 As Hitler openly expressed hostility* towards France, Soviet Russia and the lesser powers in Central and South-Eastern Europe, these powers felt both uneasy and nervous and took steps to ensure that they were not alone if Hitler started war against them

IMPACT OF HITLER'S FOREIGN POLICY

1. Impact on Soviet Russia. Hitler's rise in Germany led to the rapproachment between the Soviet Union and France, who suffered from fear of Germany They signed a non-aggression pact as well as a conciliation convention with each other In January 1934, they signed a trade agreement for one year. *In May, 1935 Soviet Union signed* a five-year pact of mutual assistance with France and Czechoslovakia Hitler foreign policy led to Russian membership of the League of Nations on the insistence of France since France felt that common interests in defence against German aggression must be expressed by common membership of the League

The danger of Pan-German expansionism in the Baltic littoral induced both the Soviet Union and Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania to prolong their mutual non-aggression pacts till 1945 The Soviet Polish non-aggression pact was also prolonged until 1945

On July 3, 1933, Soviet Union signed a non-aggression pact with Afghanistan, Estonia, Latvia, Persia, Romania and Turkey. On the following day, she concluded a similar pact with the three Little Entente states Romania, Yugoslavia and Czechoslovakia.

Soviet and French governments prepared broad outlines for an Eastern Pact of Mutual Assistance in June 1934. It was designed of the lines of the Locarno Pact of October 1925. Its first part was to be concluded between Poland, Russia, Germany, Czechoslovakia, Finland, Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania. This part laid down that in the event of crisis these states were to hold joint consultations and render immediate military assistance to the country attacked by one of the contracting parties. The pact was to be supplemented by an additional treaty between France and Russia, by which they were to assume the same obligations as devolved on England and Italy as guarantors of the Rhine Pact of 1925. Commenting on this Pact Carr said, "The plan seemed somewhat artificial; for it was difficult to imagine any circumstances in which Germany would obtain the help of France against the Soviet Union or of the Soviet Union against France. In February 1935, the Draft was approved by Britain. However, the German government raised certain objections tantamounting to her refusal.

2. Impact on the Foreign Policy of Italy. Mussolini saw in it the victory of Fascism, though he did not show eagerness to conclude political agreement with Nazi Germany. Though Italy favoured revision of Peace Treaty, as Mussolini was strongly opposed to the Austro-German Union, it would bring Germany on the borders of Italy and threaten South Tirol. Accordingly he supported the government of Dollfuss, against the wishes Hitler. A series of political-cum-economic agreements were concluded by Italy, Austria and Hungary in March 1934 which led to the establishment of a sort of Italo Austro-Hungarian bloc. But Italy kept the door open for collaboration with Germany while negotiating with Hungary.

3. Impact on the Foreign Policy of France. France was greatly alarmed by the rise of Nazi Government in Germany. Hitler had openly advocated the scrapping of the Versailles treaty and changing the *status quo.* As in case of German aggression France was not quite sure of the attitude of her ally, Great Britain, she sought to strengthen her security by concluding agreements with countries perturbed by the rise of Nazi Government. As Italy was equally afraid of Hitler after his intervention in Austria, a series of agreements were signed between the two countries in January 1935 by which they ironed out the mutual differences and agreed upon the attitude to be adopted if Germany pursued a policy of aggression. Both agreed to consult each other and to recommend to Austria and all her neighbouring states to enter into a pact not to intervene in each other's sphere. In the event of a threat to the Austrian independence, they agreed to consult together with Austria and such

other of her neighbours as might be willing to participate in a joint action In settlement of her claims France ceded to Italy a strip of French equatorial Africa adjacent to the Italian province of Libya and a small triangle of French Somalia adjoining Eritrea Italian status in Tunis was regulated France also showed her disinterestedness in any concessions which Italy might obtain from Abyssinia She also sought co operation of Soviet Russia and concluded with her a five year Mutual Assistance Pact in 1935, by which the two agreed to come to each other's assistance if attacked by any European power On the same lines, France also concluded a pact with Czechoslovakia

4. Impact on Little Entente States. The Little Entente States (Yugoslavia, Romania and Czechoslovakia) were greatly perturbed by the establishment of Nazi Government The Germans aimed at the inclusion of all German speaking people in the Third Reich The Nazi Revolution in Germany further increased the divergences of interests among the Little Entente States Yugoslavia was more scared of Italy than Germany, Romania was afraid of Russia But Yugoslavia and Czechoslovakia were not the enemy of Romania Czechoslovakia was afraid of Germany She was however not affected by the power of Italy

All these differences were overcome by the Entente States On February 16,1933 a pact of reorganisation was signed at Geneva By this pact the three countries agreed to conduct a common foreign policy An economic council was set up for the co-ordination of all their economic interests

5 Impact on Balkan Nations Balkan peninsula felt greatly nervous by the rise of Hitler to power, and the withdrawal of Germany from the League of Nations An organisation on the line of the Little Entente known as *Balkan* Entente was formed on February 9,1934 between Turkey, Yugoslavia Romania and Greece The signatories agreed to guarantee each other's frontiers The Pact also instructed each of the signatories not to join an outside power that committed aggression against any one of them Thus the Balkan Entente was a defensive alliance and not a non-aggression pact

6 Impact on the Foreign Policy of England. Britain was annoyed by the rise of Hitler and the various measures adopted by him However inwardly Great Britain felt happy that Germany was recovering from her down graded position Therefore, she adopted an attitude of reconciliation towards Germany though at the same time she did not annoy France

In March 1935, Hitler introduced conscription and started remilitarisation in violation of the Treaty of Versailles Great Britain did not lodge any protest with Hitler She did not ask the machinery of the League to restrain Hitler from doing so Instead she accepted Hitler's offer to limit German naval strength to 35 per cent of the British strength On June 18, 1935

a formal Anglo-German Naval Agreement was signed. By it Great Britain openly recognised Germany's right to flout the treaty of Versailles. This encouraged Hitler to go ahead with his programme of aggression. However, when Hitler in violation of his declared principles, undertook an invasion of Poland, England abandoned her policy of appeasement towards Germany and *embarked on a policy of resisting foreign aggression.*

ACHIEVEMENTS OF HITLER'S FOREIGN POLICY

1. Change in International Relations. On October 14, 1933, Hitler boycotted the Disarmament Conference. Germany resigned from the League of Nations. She broke the Disarmament Section of the Peace Treaty of Versailles, through a plebiscite held in Germany on November 10,1936. This policy of rearmament was supported by 95% of the German people. With the popular support of his policy, Hitler not merely repudiated the Treaty of Versailles and other imposed treaties but also sought friends to help him in his plan.

2. Strengthening Eastern Border. Hitler was a shrewd diplomat. He successfully concluded a Non-Aggression Pact with Poland and cremated the long-standing animosity. By this he strengthened his position and eliminated his worries about the eastern border.

3. Rise in Opposition. Hitler wished to annex Austria-his motherland. However, Mussolini warned that if Germany persisted in its decision to usurp Austria, Italy would declare war against Germany. Russia relinquished the policy of isolation. In 1935, France made a treaty of alliance with Italy and Austria. These political reactions gave a serious blow to Hiter's expansionist policy. His unsuccessful attempt to annex Austria gave rise to all round opposition.

4. Annexation of Saar. The year 1935 brought about a remarkable success to Germany. A plebiscite was held in the Saar region in accordance with the provision of the Treaty of Versailles on March 1, 1935. Saar gave verdict in favour of Germany and the region went to Germany.

5. Armament of Rhine region and repudiation of Locarno Treaty. On June 18, 1935 Hitler entered into Anglo-German Naval Agreement. On March 7, 1936 Germany declared that its army was going to march in Rhine a demilitarized zone under the Locarno Treaty. France sought help from Britain, but the latter kept mum. Therefore, Germany became successful in her attempt.

6. The formation of Rome-Berlin-Tokyo Axis. The Abyssinian aggression by Italy and its condemnation by Britain helped Hitler sign Treaty of Friendship between German and Italy. Thus Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy joined hands. In terms of his plans envisaged in the *Mein Kamph,* Hitler now extended his hands of friendship towards Japan. On November 6, 1937

Rome-Berlin-Tokyo Axis was formed It strengthened the position of Germany to the maximum On March 12, 1938 the Mein Kamph Plan of annexation of Austria was completed While this annexation gave strength to Germany it also weakened the bulwark against Nazis

7. The Munich Pact of September 29, 1938 This pact between Germany, Italy, Great Britain and France brought about the conquest of Czechoslovakia by Germany By that step Germany improved her position strategically in international field while France and Britain suffered a lot and Soviet Russia felt annoyed The concept of collective security enshrined in the Covenant of the League of Nations collapsed Churchill said, 'Britain and France had to choose between war and dishonour They chose dishonour They will have war"

8. World War II. The foreign policy of Hitler aimed at

(i) Integration of all German People under the limits of bigger territory,

(ii) Nullification of the Treaty of Versailles and other Peace treaties,

(iii) Theory of Force When Germany invaded Poland the fire of the World War II was its The Allied Powers came forward to counter-balance the aggressive designs of Germany

QUESTIONS FOR EXERCISE

Write a note on Weimer Constitution Why did it fail?

2 Trace the Circumstances which led to the rise of Adolf Hitler "The Versailles Treaty was mainly responsible for the rise of Nazism in Germany" Comment

3 "The advent of Hitler to power in Germany in 1933 transformed the international political situation" Discuss

4 "It was natural that the appearance of a Germany supposed to be animated by the ideals of Mein Kampf and the Nazi programme should produce immediate reactions in Europe" (Gathrone Hardy) Elaborate

5 "The German frontiers are the outcome of chance and are only temporary frontiers that have been established as a result of political struggle which took peace at variation State frontiers are established by human beings and may be changed by human beings" Mein Kampf Discuss

22

Turkey Under Mustafa Kamal Pasha

Though different from other constituents of the region, Turkey is a part of Middle East. She is adjacent to Europe. This has assigned her a place among great European States. She has intimate links with many European organisations. She is one of the most powerful states in the Middle East.

After the First World War, the condition of Turkey was deteriorating. She was defeated and humiliated and compelled to sign the Treaty of Serves about which Hall and Davis wrote, "This treaty of Serves, harsher than that of Versailles, harsher than that of Brest Litovsk, was well named to porcelain treaty."

LEADERSHIP OF MUSTAFA KAMAL

Headed by Mustafa Kamal Turkish Nationalists demanded freedom of self-determination to the regions of Ottoman empire inhabited by Turks.

Mustafa Kamal Pasha launched strong Nationalist movement. The Nationalist Party specified the following demands :

1. All those areas must be returned to Turkey, which were taken away by the Treaty of Serves.

2. A plebiscite should he held in the Eastern region.

3. Constantinople should be guaranteed security and peace.

4. All foreign troops should be withdrawn from Turkey.

The Nationalist Party led by Mustafa Kamal Pasha rejected everything established by the Treaty of Serves. The victory of Nationalist Party was the decay and nullification of the Treaty of Serves. Contemporary international conditions were in favour of Turkey. She was capable of negotiating a treaty with Allies on equal terms. Mustafa Kamal Pasha had already shown his valour as Turkish Commander at Gallipoli. In 1919, he was elected the Inspector-General of the Turkish Army. In the same year Greece ordered Turkey to vacate Constantinople. Mustafa fought very well with Greeks, but Britishers exiled him from Constantinople.

Election as President

Mustafa moved towards Ankara after leaving Constantinople The Nationalists elected him the President and Commander-in-Chief of the Nationalist Government In 1920, Mustafa Pasha attacked Armenia He succeeded in his attempt to reunite Kars and Ardhan with Turkey and compelled the other party to sign the Treaty of Gumru In 1921, Italians left Turkey and Mustafa entered into a treaty with the U S S R by which he got a huge quantity of arms and ammunitions In 1921, he entered into an agreement with France, which established peace

Attack on Greeks

Now Mustafa turned to evicting Greeks from the Turkish land When the Prime Minister Venizelos was defeated Constantine became new Prime Minister of Greeks He had been very rude towards Allies in the First World War Even France did not like Constantine

In August 1922, Turkey defeated Greeks under the leadership of Mustafa Kamal in the battle of Sakaria river In 1922 Smyrne was captured Now Mustafa turned to the problem of Constantinople Britain asked the Allies powers to protect the neutrality of states but France and Italy observed silence Avoiding a war with Britain, Mustafa accepted the formula that Straits will be under international control Greek forces withdrew themselves upto the river Maritsa

Treaty of Lausanne

Invitations were sent for a conference at Lausanne to solve the problem of straits of United States of America, Britain, France, U S S R , Italy, Romania, Yugoslavia, Japan, Greece and Turkey Treaty of Lausanne was signed on April 24,1933 Its main provisions were the following

1. Turkey got back Thrace and Adrianople However, Mesopotamia, Arabia, Syria and Palestine became free from the control of Turkey
2. The British occupation of Cyprus was recognised
3. Turkey renounced her claim over Sudan, Libya and Egypt
4. Turkey promised to safeguard the interests of minorities
5. All foreign forces were to withdraw from Turkey
6. The earlier restrictions upon the naval, military and air force of Turkey were withdrawn

By the Lausanne treaty Turkey became free of all foreign control She regained her lost prestige in which Mustafa Kamal Pasha played a memorable role

FOREIGN RELATIONS OF TURKEY 1923-1945

Objectives

Following were the main objectives of Turkish foreign policy :

1. To ensure the political security.
2. To solve border problems.
3. To from an alliance with the U.S.S.R. for fighting against Western States.
4. To enter into alliance with the States of Middle East.

Foreign Policy

1. Relation with Soviet Russia. Russia, like Turkey, was also against Western powers. This like-mindedness led to the formation of an alliance between the two countries. Both give recognition of the revolutions in the Orient. Both won world-wide applause for their stand on "the rights of these people to freedom, national independence and free voice in such forms of government as they themselves to have." In 1925, when Turkey had a dispute with Britain over the question of Mosul, Russia and Turkey signed a treaty for mutual defence. But Turkey never favoured growth of communism. Whenever they tried to uplift their heads communists were crushed in Turkey. The pact of 1929 signed by Russia and Germany made Turkey restless. While Turkey, wanted to maintain a balance of power Soviet Russia did not agree to it. Consequently, when Germany attacked Soviet Russia Turkey remained neutral. Their relation became worse during the Second World War. In future they could never come to sweet relations once enjoyed in 1925.

2. Relations with France. France had tried its best to demolish the Nationalist Movement of Turkey. As Turkey had opposed the Allied powers western powers tried their best to ruin the condition of Turkey after the First World War. The French declaration of 1926, awarding independence to Abessynia and Alexandria gave much annoyance to Turkey. In 1936 a treaty was signed through with a Franco-Turkish joint rule was declared in Alexandria.

3. Relations with Britain. The relations of Turkey with western powers became worse over the issue of Mosul and Strait of Dardanellese. However, with the treaty of 1919, named as Anglo-Turkey treaty, Turkey relinquished its claim over Mosul and got 10% of the oil resources in return.

4. Relations with Germany. Montreaux convention in 1936 improved the relations of Turkey with western powers. Turkey now became a supporter of Collective Security. In 1932 she joined the League of Nations. In 1937, Turkey-signed an economic treaty with Britain. In 1939 Turkey, Great Britain, and France signed an agreement. Turkey was promised all help if Germany attacked her. In the Second World War, she observed policy of Neutrality till

1944 When the German defeat was certain, Turkey declared war against Germany Between the World Wars relations between Turkey and Germany were cordial Both the countries fought against the Allied powers and both met with the same fate

5. Relations with Italy. Turkey was always suspicious about the possibility of Italy's claim over Anatolia She remained friendly with Italy till the rise of Mussolini A Treaty of Neutrality was signed in 1928 But when Italy expanded its territory in the Mediterranean in 1937 it strained the relations between Italy and Turkey

In the Spanish Civil War in 1939 Turkey resented the Italio-German intervention Two years later when Alkaines was attacked by Italy, Turkey entered into an agreement with Great Britain and France In June 1941, Germany and Turkey agreed to a ten-year Non-Aggression Pact In 1944 to keep her friendly relations with Russia intact Italy declared war on Germany

6 Relations with Middle East. Turkey did not face any obstruction from the Middle East

7. Relations with Afghanistan In 1922 a treaty was signed between the two countries in which they agreed to fight against the imperialist powers It recognised Turkey as the leader of the Nationalist Movement in West Asia An alliance was formed by Turkey, Afghanistan and Iran In 1920 Turkey signed a treaty with Persia

In 1937 Turkey signed a pact with Afghanistan, Iran, Iraq for security of Middle East Friendly relations were established with Austria, Hungary and Balkans In 1930 Turkey's relationship with Greece improved At the First Balkan Conference at Ankara, in 1929 Turkey established cordial relations with Romania and Yugoslavia Collective Security System for Balkan regions was established at its initiative through the Balkan Pact in 1934

QUESTIONS FOR EXERCISE

1 Dwell upon the relations of Turkey with other countries from the year 1919 to 1945

2 Comment on the policy of Mustafa Kamal Pasha in upbringing Turkey from its wrecked condition

3 Explain the foreign relations of Turkey at various stages of international events

4 Bring out the foreign policy of Turkey from 1923-1945.

23

Rise of Soviet Russia

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The formation of the unified Soviet State was an unprecedented event in mankind's history and a most important one after the victory of the October Revolution. The formation of the USSR through the voluntary unification of the people was a great achievement of the Lenin's policy of nationalities. Prior to the Bolshevik Revolution, Russia was ruled by the Czars and had a monarchical type of Government. Under the Rule of the Czars she had made treaty with France and England and maintained friendly relations with them.

Foreign Policy before the Russian Revolution (1917)

Prior to the Bolshevik Revolution in 1917, the Soviet foreign policy was guided by her geographical and economic factors. She wanted to have trade and business relations with Asian countries and control over the entrance into the Mediterranean Sea and the port of Bosphorus. In Far East her policy included ports in Manchuria. Russia wanted to keep her frontiers safe and secure. For this purpose she wanted to have smaller states on the west that could serve as buffer state against threat from large nations.

Impact of Soviet Revolution of 1917

On June 28, 1914 Arch Duke Ferdinand, the heir to the Austrian throne, was murdered by the Serbian terrorists. Austria held Serbia responsible for such heinous crime and declared war against Serbia. But Russia joined hands with Serbia. Therefore, on August 5, Austria declared war on Russia. Germany had already declared war against Russia on August 1, 1914. Meanwhile the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917 changed the trend of war. As there were internal troubles in Russia she became crippled in her military strength. Therefore Lenin did not prefer war but announced to adopt neutral posture to bring socialism in Russia. This change in outlook impeded Russia who had been fighting with the Allied Powers. Bolsheviks gradually turned Russia into a communist country. The Russian leaders turned their attention towards peace. Soviet Russia entered into a "No War Pact" with Germany and her Allies. In March

1918, she had to sign an armistice under which she had to part with vast chunks of her territories to Allies and agree for the creation of independent states of Finland, Lithuania and Estonia so far under her control

Lenin led the seizure of supreme power in Russia by the Bolsheviks This event left deep impact both on the internal and international politics It put a violent end to the Tsarist autocracy By expropriation of the landlord, nationalisation of the land and banks, the repudiation of foreign obligations of the Tsarist government and disenfranchising all 'non-working' people the new rulers inaugurated the reign of 'pure communism' In spite of protests of the Allies, they withdrew Russia from the war and in March 1918 concluded the Treaty of Brest Litovosk The revolution struck terror in the minds of the ruling class of other capitalist states The establishment of the Third International led to the class struggle in other countries The Allied army, the White Generals made efforts for the collapse of the red regime Inspired by the slogan 'Socialist Fatherland in danger' the Red army achieved marvelous success and beat back all these armies By the end of 1920 the Soviet Union had successfully terminated all foreign and civil wars

FOREIGN POLICY OF SOVIET RUSSIA (1917-1935)

The foreign policy of Soviet Russia was very much determined by the country's location, climate, economic interest, historic traditions, ideology as well as the relative strength of the other centres of powers It was also influenced by suspicion towards Western Europe which stemmed out of the continuous aggression to crush the Russian revolution during the years 1917-21, as well as their refusal to give recognition to the Communist government of Russia

Thus during the period from 1917 to 1935 the foreign policy of Soviet Russia was not a continuation of the Czarist foreign policy It was determined by the communist ideology It may be divided into following phases

1. Western Intervention (1917-1921) During the period 1917-21 the Foreign Policy of Russia was to a great extent shaped by two events—Russia's attempt at creating a world communist revolution and the counter revolution in Russia with the support of the Western powers Russia's relations with the Western power were strained, because, after the revolution, she propagated the inevitability of a conflict between the communist and the non-communist countries Russia's withdrawal from the war and conclusion of peace treaty of Brest-Litovosk with Germany further embittered her relations with the Allies who alleged that Soviet Government had deliberately concluded peace with the Germans to enable her to concentrate all her forces in the West Russia's repudiation of the Tzarist debts and nationalisation of foreign industrial enterprises created friction, which was further aggravated in 1918 when she nationalised foreign trade The military intervention of western states in

favour of the counter-revolutionaries also embittered the relations of Soviet Union with Western powers.

2. Defensive Isolation (1921-34). As compared to the Western nations, the Soviet Union was hopelessly weak. The Russians followed a policy of concluding non-aggression pacts. To save Germany from the Western powers, Russia concluded the Treaty of Rapallo with Germany in 1922. The other measures in this direction were the pacts with Turkey (1925), Germany (1926), Poland, Finland, Latvia and Estonia in 1932. However, in the economic sphere Russia aimed at a sound economic base. For that purpose she was willing to cooperate with capitalist countries. In 1920-21 she entered into trade agreements with Britain. To expand her trade and to secure foreign loans during this period (1921-32) Soviet Russia tried to establish friendly relations with all countries indiscriminately. However, due to the activities of the Comintern, the European powers continued to be distrustful of Russia as before. As Schumann wrote, "Soviet wrote, diplomats offered co-operation, but comintern agents preached revolution".

Russia stood for total and universal disarmament. She gave unqualified support to the Pact of Paris in 1928. She sponsored the Litninov Protocol in 1929. She concluded innumerable bilateral and multilateral agreements to build a security system based on neutrality and non-aggression. More than once, she expressed her desire to join the League of Nations, if it would preserve peace and security in the world. She wanted to live in peace and amity and avoid all sorts of international tensions and war. However, in spite of her best intentions and efforts the Western powers were keen to restore capitalism in the Soviet Union. At Locarno (1925), they made a bold bid to bring Germany back into their orbit. This estranged Soviet Russia and forced her to live in defensive isolation.

3. Co-operation with the West (1934-38). During this period the Soviet Russia abandoned her policy of 'defensive isolation' and instead adopted the policy of co-operation with the West. The aggressive policy of Japan in the Far East culminated in her occupation of Manchuria in 1932 and the rise of Hitler and his Nazi party in Germany. Soviet Union felt the need for the cooperation of the Western countries. With the success of the five year plans in Russia the living standard of the people improved and the liberal principles gained currency leading to the policy of rapprochement with the West. To protect the Communist movement against the Fascist powers Russia concluded non-aggression pacts which Afghanistan, Estonia, Latvia, Persia, Poland and Turkey in 1933. She also resumed diplomatic relations with China and recognised the territorial settlements of the Treaty of Versailles. After the withdrawal of Japan and Germany from the League, she joined League as a permanent member and a staunch supporter of collective security through the League. As the rise of Hitler in Germany had posed

threat to both Russia and France, they made a non-aggression Pact Mutual Assistance Pact concluded between France and Russia in 1935, and between Russia and Czechoslovakia These countries agreed to 'aid and assist' each other in case of unprovoked aggression by any European state Diplomatic relations were established between U S A and Soviet Russia, and a treaty was concluded to preserve the territorial integrity of each other and to prohibit subversive activities and propaganda against each other This treaty was made possible by the rise of Japan a common foe, in the Far East

4 Dangerous Isolation (1938-39). The Munich Pact was a turning point in the foreign policy of Soviet Russia, as she was not invited to the Munich Conference When Austria was occupied by Germany, Russia proposed to the western powers to take a firm stand against Germany, but it was not accepted To guard against the possible aggression of Germany and Italy, Russia proposed a triple alliance between Russia, Britain and France, which was rejected by the Western powers Therefore, Russia concluded a non-aggression pact with Germany to preserve her security and interests She was now free to remain neutral in the war between Germany and Western States, she also retained the right to receive help from the Western powers in case of Germany's aggression against her

5 Collaboration with Germany (August 1939 to June 1941) Russia violated treaties with Finland, Estonia, Lativa, Lithuania, Poland, Romania and all the Baltic states The fall of France in June 1940 and the possibility of collapse of the British armies before the German armies, prompted Russia to maintain association with Germany and Japan She continued her cooperation with Germany In April, 1941 she concluded a non-aggression pact with Japan

6 The Period of War (June 1941 to 1945). In spite of entering into a non-aggression pact with Germany Russia knew it fully well that a clash with Germany was inevitable Therefore, she continued to prepare for her defence at fast pace Her apprehensions came out true when Germany mounted an attack against her in August, 1941 Thus she was also involved in the Second World War Prime Minister Churchill declared "The Russian danger is, therefore, our danger ' Russia on her part singed the Atlantic Charter and all other Declarations in relation to the war-policy of the Allied powers, in the hope of getting co-operation of West In spite of cooperation between Soviet Union and the Allied powers none could completely rely upon the other The Soviet victory in the battle of Stalingrad perplexed the Allies They were convinced that Russia was capable of winning the war without the support Hence from November 1943 onwards the Allies maintained secrecy from Russia in all matters Without the knowledge of Russia, U S A concluded a treaty with France and England and opened negotiations for an armistice with Bulgaria In 1945 at the Conference of Yalta, San-Francisco and Potsdam it became evident that

an unbridgeable gulf exists between Russia and the Allies. The distrust which had prevailed between Soviet Union and the Western powers right from the year 1917 gave rise to the cold war, which started between Soviet Union and the Western powers after 1945.

Due to lack of frankness on the part of Soviet Russia as well as the Allies Russian relations with Western powers remained unfriendly. This was mainly due to the impact of Communist ideology on the Soviet foreign policy which preached the inevitability of conflict between the Communist and the non-Communist world and condemned imperialism. The Soviet policy throughout this period was based on changing strategy and tactics. Her talk of peace, peaceful co-existence, disarmament and non-aggression was a tactical manoeuvre. She tried to draw a wedge in the capitalist camp by playing one country against the other. She tried to create her own spheres of influence in international politics. She used Comintern for interference in the internal affairs of other countries. All these Russian activities led to 'cold war' in the post World War II period.

QUESTIONS FOR EXERCISE

1. Examine the main features of the Soviet foreign policy from 1919 to 1937.
2. Discuss the foreign policy of Russia after the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917.
3. 'Soviet Foreign policy is based on the principles formulated by Lenin, above all on the principle of proletarian internationalism'. Comment.

24

Spanish Civil War

Before it was conquered by the barbarians in 406 A D Spain formed a part of the Roman Empire In 720 A D it was conquered by Arab Muslims and remained under their domination till 1492 By 16th Century she became a rival of England in the race of colonisation But due to her internal conflicts and convulsions she declined and remained a third-rate power Spain began to consolidate herself in the present century When the World War broke out Spain remained neutral though while the clergies, army, bureaucracy, etc , had pro-German leanings, the intellectuals and the working classes were pro-Allies This policy of neutrality during the First World War proved beneficial for Spain In 1923 started civil war in Spain All the European countries were interested in Spanish Civil War None wanted to calm it down All tried to inflame it though few like France and England remained neutral The leading Fascists powers of Germany and Italy interfered on the plea that they wanted the elimination of communist's hope to plant their thoughts in the Spanish soil On the other hand, Russia was infuriated because of the Fascist declaration against the spread of communism Fascists declaration was merely intended to keep France and England away from the war The latter also did not want to wash their hands in the waters of civil war Thus national interest was the single potential motive i e , of all who took part in favour or against

EVENTS AND CAUSES OF SPANISH CIVIL WAR

About the cause of Spanish Civil War writer E H Carr has written, "The Spanish Civil War might not in other circumstances have been an international event The causes which made it one were of two kinds In the first place, Italy fresh from her Abyssinian victory, which had thrown into relief the strategic importance of the Mediterranean, welcomed an opportunity to strengthen her position in Western Mediterranean waters Secondly, the nation had grown up since the First World War that a country whose internal organisation was based on a certain political theory was expected to encourage and assist the triumph of that theory in other countries "

1. Three Opposing Forces The potentiality of the First World

War did not spare the neutral Spain. Spain faced certain obstacles created by the following three political forces functioning in Spain after the First World War.

(i) *People's demand.* There was popular demand in Spain to constitute the parliamentary system of government as a substitute to the existing system of monarch.

(ii) *Desire of Military Committees.* On the other hand, military committees were enjoying unquestioned patronage of the royalty in Spain. They never wanted that parliamentary system be implemented in Spain.

(iii) *Demand of the People of Catalonia.* People of Catalonia were dissatisfied with the central rule. They were of the opinion that their interest was overlooked by the monarchy. They were clamouring for separation from the mainland of Spain.

It became difficult for Spain to run its administration as these above three forces created havoc. People went on demanding parliamentary form of government.

2. Revolt of Riff Tribes. When Riff tribes revolted against Spain the situation became explosive. 10,000 Spanish soldiers were killed in the effort to suppress the hostile camp. This caused humiliation to Spanish people. They held the king responsible for this insult.

3. The Camp of 1923. The ruling king was expelled. A military junta was established under the leadership of Capt. Franco de Rivera. Their military administration was as good as a military dictator rules. A new constitutional system was introduced crowning the military dictator as the President of Spain. People of Spain were discontented and wanted democratic form of administration. Unlike other European countries Spanish people had no middle class representative who could represent their sentiments. Ultimately, the Military rulers ordered for a popular election to facilitate the people to choose their own government.

4. Popular Elections of 1931. In 1931 were ordered elections at national level. The Republicans and Socialists got an opportunity to vindicate their importance. Military junta was totally rejected by the people. Republicans and Socialists were brought on the national scene. Unable to defeat at polls the Military Directorate ordered the commander of the civil guard to suppress these two political forces. The commander declined to suppress the people's voice. These happenings however, frustrated the king who decided to abdicate his crown soon after the results of the election was declared. Sanor Zamora was offered to head the new government. He refused assume the to chair unless he was approved by the people's vote. He ordered general elections. People voted for the Republicans and socialists and thus banned the military rule. Spain was declared a *Democratic Republic of Workers* of all class.

Problems of the New Government

The new democratic government faced the following problems

1 The massive impact of the economic depression of world wide nature

2 The separatist movement of the people of Catalonia

3 *Sharp differences between the supporters and antagonists of Church*

4 Conflict of ideologies between the nobles and peasants

5 Conflict between the Socialists and Republicans The socialists wanted nation-wide reforms to be introduced in favour of the peasants and working class

Achievements of the New Government

1 Though the Government fought valiantly against the problem of economic depression it failed to contain it

2 Since all the countries of Europe created 'Tariff Walls' foreign trade France was badly affected

3 As the new government awarded local autonomy the people of Catalonia withdrew their movement However, the people of Andalusia were still disturbed

4 Law and order situation kept on deteriorating day after day due to friction in the ruling party and heated discussion among parliamentarians

President Zamora dissolved the Parliament and formed the new cm

Working of the New Coalition Ministry

As the Socialists and Republicans were defeated at the polls the Reactionary Party of feudal lords and pro churchmen came into power The government was formed by the coalition of

(i) The moderate Republicans (ii) The Fascists,
(iii) The Clerygymen and (iv) The Landlords

This Anti-Socialist government decided to do away with the works undertaken by the preceding government The Catalonia declared her an independent nation There was a fierce fighting in parliament Finding no alternative the President again dissolved the parliament

Now, the Socialists, Communists and Anarchists were voted to power However, the opponents again devoted their whole time and energy in obstructing the functions of the new government

5 General Franco's Revolt The peace in Spain was lost The Rightists and Leftists were busy in their 'legpulling' tactics No one was confident of the victory These happenings of national character, in Spain acquired international colour due to the following two reasons

1. Victory over Ethiopia encouraged Italy to intervene in the national affairs of Spain to get an edge over Britain and France.

2. The tendency of all European countries to propagate their own national ideologies.

The parties supporting Nazis, the Fascists and Communists tried their best to draw the public opinion in Spain in their favour by propagating their ideologies. European countries started taking deep interest in Spain. To crush the Rightists the Leftists sought help from Germany and Italy and assured them to raise the level of revolt if they were victorious at polls. Exploiting the situation, General Franco of Moracco led a revolt against Italy and appealed the people to support him. Under the protection of Italian army he bombarded Italy. Spanish army supported the revolt. Frustrated with the counter-conflicts of Leftists and Rightists the people also supported it. General Franco captured the capital Valecia and established his reign over Spain after a lot of bloodshed.

SIGNIFICANCE OF SPANISH CIVIL WAR

Before examining the attitude of the various powers towards the Spanish war, it is desirable to know its significance. To quote Carr write, "The Spanish Civil War might not, in other circumstances, have been an international event. The causes which made it one were of two kinds. In the first place Italy, fresh from her Abyssinian victory, which had thrown into relief the strategic importance of the Mediterranean welcomed an opportunity to strengthen her position in Western Mediterranean waters. Secondly, the nation had grown up since the First World War that a country whose internal organisation was based on a certain political theory was expected to encourage and assist the triumph of that theory in other countries."

ATTITUDES OF OTHER NATIONS

1. Attitude of Italy and Germany. Treating the Spanish Civil War as a struggle between Communism and Fascism, Italy and Germany decided to support the rebels. Italian soldiers poured into Spain to fight on the side of the rebels. Italian aeroplanes assisted Franco in the transportation of aviators and technicians to Franco. Both did everything within their power to overthrow the democratic government. Their self-interests warranted this action. Italy wanted to consolidate her position in the Mediterranean. A friendly Spain could be of much help to her in eliminating the British in Europe, Africa, Spain and the Canaries Islands was helpful to Italy to weaken the grip of Britishers on the straits of Gibraltar. Germany saw in the emergence of Spain under Franco, a chance to reduce the French concentration on the German frontier. She also expected to get bases from where she could check the British fleet in the Atlantic.

2. Attitude of Great Britain and France. France and England were keen to follow the policy of neutrality and localise the Spanish conflict Both treated the Spanish war an internal matter of Spain They set up an "International Non-Intervention Committee" consisting of U.K , France, Germany, Italy and Portugal to ensure that they did not supply war material to either side This agreement proved ineffective While Italy and Germany continued to send arms to the insurgents, Soviet Union sent the same to the government

The attitude to 'neutrality' on the part of England and France was dictated by their national interests They felt that Fascism alone could counter Communism Therefore, they favoured the rise of Franco to power By appeasing Franco England sought to safeguard her control over Gibralter. As Italy was supporting Franco, France was left with no other choice but to follow the policy of non-interference

3. Attitude of Soviet Union Among Big Powers, Soviet Union alone supported the Spanish Government because she feared the rise of Fascist regime in Spain Though baffled by the designs of Hitler and Mussolini, Russia, unlike Italy and Germany, did not send any regular troops to Spain to fight on the side of the government Rather she offered to sell arms for "cash on the board' to Spanish government though she could not procure sufficient arms However, on many occasions the Spanish government could smash the plans of the rebels only with the support and equipments of ussia

4. Attitude of U.S A. Though adopting an attitude of isolation in the Spanish war, America welcomed the emergence of Fascist states in Europe to counter the Communist menace In 1938 when the Italian bombers raided the Spanish capital, Patrick Cardinal Hayes of U S A publicly prayed for the success of General Franco

5 Attitude of the League of Nations. The attitude of the League of Nations was unhelpful to the Spanish government On a number of appeals from the Spanish Government, the League adopted a resolution on December 12, calling upon all members to refrain from interference in the internal affairs of another state The assembly of the League adopted a resolution on October 2, 1937 declaring that there were 'veritable foreign corps on Spanish soil' and urging upon the members to immediately and completely withdraw them However, the volunteers of Italy and Germany left Spain only after Franco and his rebels had won a decisive victory Italy and Germany had accorded recognition to the Franco Government on November 18, 1936 In order to impose an effective blockade upon Loyalist ports and deprive the Spanish government of all assistance from abroad, these powers had also pleaded for grant of belligerent status to the rebels On February 27, 1939 the Franco regime was recognized by England and France and by U S A on April, 1939. These democratic powers soon after rushed with aid and loans to the Franco regime

CONSEQUENCES OF SPANISH CIVIL WAR

The Spanish Civil War had the following far-reaching consequences:

1. Encouragement to Italy and Germany. The attitude of the Western Democracies showing scare of Communism and war encouraged Italy and Germany to go ahead with their programme of conquests.

2. Blow to Collective Security. As the League failed to deal with the Italian and German interference in the internal affairs of Spain its prestige was undermined. This gave a blow to the system of collective security.

3. European Civil War in Spain. The Spanish Civil War to quote Carr write, "assumed many of the aspects of a European civil war fought on Spanish territory". While Italian and German troops were fighting on the side of the insurgents, the contingents of Russians, anti-Fascist Italians and anti-Nazi Germans, as well as volunteers from other countries were fighting on the side of the Spanish government. The participation of Italy, Russia, Germany and Portugal was not dictated by ideological motives but by the interests of these powers. In a friendly Spain Italy saw the possibility of checking British naval power in the Mediterranean, Germany saw in it the reduction of French forces on the Franco-German frontiers. Russians supported Spanish Government because Franco was being supported by the Germans. Self-interest dictated policy of neutrality followed by France and England, and the policy of isolation followed by U.S.A. However, the results of the war demonstrated that all these powers had miscalculated the future and wasted their energies. Though sympathising with the Axis powers during the Second World War, Spain observed fairly correct neutrality.

It is wrong to say that "Spanish Civil War of 1936 was a trial balloon of international power politics, which was to usher in the thunderous outbreak of the Global War of 1939".

QUESTIONS FOR EXERCISE

1. Discuss the issues involved in the Spanish Civil War and assess its significance for international politics of the period.
2. "Spanish Civil War was a trial balloon of International Power Politics." Explain and discuss.
3. "The truth of the matter is that states are interested only in a balance which is in their favour ... . The balance desired is the one which neutralises other states, leaving the home state free to be the deciding face and the deciding voice". (Nicholas J. Spykman). Does it apply to the outbreak of the Civil War in Spain ?
4. Discuss the role of other countries in the Spanish Civil War. Point out the consequences of this Civil War.

25

International Relations in Middle East (1919 to 1945)

ZIONIST PROBLEM

Zionism

For a number of centuries Palestine has held an important position in the political and cultural history of the Middle East She has been under foreign rule at different times First she was under the Roman Empire and then she came under Turkish domination In the latter half of the 19th century a movement started for the grant of independent Jewish state This movement is known as Zionism It was organised by Leon Piansker, a Jewish medical practitioner of Russia Later, Theodor Harzl, a Jewish journalist of Austria joined this movement

Due to Zionism immigration began to flow into Palestine It roused the antagonism of the Arabs who were the principal occupations of the land on economic grounds Arabs feared that with their higher degree of education and greater industry, the jews would swamp the Arabs and eventually displace them

Role of Britain

World War I gave a further fillip to the Zionist Movement Britain did its best to rouse Arabs and Jews against their Turkish overlords During the War Britain declared her policy towards Palestine through the famous declaration made by British Foreign Secretary Arthur Balfour Balfour declared "His Majesty's Government view with favour the establishment in Palestine of a National Home for the Jewish people, and will use their best endeavours to facilitate the achievement of this object, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of the existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine or the rights and political status enjoyed by the Jewish in any other country"

This declaration provoked Arab resentment. Britain made several promises both oral and written to Arabs to pacify that nothing would be done to whittle down the economic and political relations. She promised independence to the Arab population and that if Palestine were to become a Jewish state it would be done with the consent of Arabs.

Palestine After World War I

In 1920, after World War I, Great Britain was given the mandate for Palestine. It laid an obligation on Britain to "place the country under such political, administrative and economic conditions as will secure the establishment of the Jewish national home, while at the same time safeguarding the civil and religious rights of all the inhabitants of Palestine." But as Great Britain had made contradictory promises to Jews and the Arabs, through vague undertakings, the question of Palestine posed a great problem. The Arabs were not willing to permit any more Jewish immigration into Palestine. The Zionists were determined to bring more and more immigrants into country and buy up land from the enterprising Arabs.

The Arabs were in majority in Palestine till 1919. Jews from all parts of the world began to pour into Palestine for the first few years after the establishment of British Mandate in Palestine under the Treaty of Versailles. The influx of the jews was rather modest for the first few years. But as the economic depression hit the world, they entered into Palestine in large numbers. This influx further increased when Hitler embarked on the policy of mass killing of Jews in Germany. By the end of 1934 the number of Jews in Palestine had reached 300,000. This was not tolerable to the Arabs and they resorted to non-cooperation with Britain. Hence, the British could not set up the elected Council to run the administration. The British High Commissioner governed practically as 'an all powerful Sultan'. Between 1919 to 1933 a number of riots and clashes marked the British administration in Palestine.

Solution of Palestine Problem

The Palestine question posed a serious problem to the Britishers who had made contradictory commitments to the Jews and the Arabs. In the Great Britain appointed seven commissions in a span of twenty-six years to solve this thorny problem.

1. King Crane Commission. The First Commission was set up under pressure from the U.S. President Wilson. It was known as King-Crane Commission an Anglo-American Commission. As the recommendations of this commission were opposed to the interests of the Jews, they were not made public.

2. Hay Craft Commission. *In 1921 Britain set up Hay-Craft* Commission to find out the causes of riots which had broken out immediately after the establishment of British mandate over Palestine The Commission found that the strong anti-Jewish attitude of the Arabs was the *chief* cause of the riots

3. New Constitution of 1922 In 1922, a new constitution was announced by the British High Commissioner in Palestine It provided for a partly elected assembly and a nominated executive committee *to assist the High* Commissioner It met with disapproval of both the jews who wanted the promised Jewish state and the Arabs who were opposed to the Jewish State In 1922, Churchill declared that the Balfour Declaration did not mean "the *imposition of a Jewish nationality upon the inhabitants of Palestine as a whole,* or the further development of the existing Jewish community, with the assistance of Jews in other parts of the world in order that it may become a centre in which the Jewish people as a whole may take an interest and pride" Thus Churchill made it clear that (1) Britain did not contemplate the formation of a Jewish state over the whole of Palestine or to destroy the culture and language of the Arabs and (2) the political power of the Jews would be based on law and right.

The British Government stopped Jewish immigration in Palestine for some time to appease the Arabs The Arabs agreed to participate in the proposed legislative body's elections However, the Jews were willing to participate in the election only if they were given equal number of seats in the Assembly Thus, a stalemate was created and the proposed elections were abandoned In 1933, fresh clashes took place between the Jews and the Arabs due to the direct outcome of the British High Commissioner's decision to lift the ban on the immigration of Jews in Palestine

4 Peel Commission 1938 In 1936 a Royal Commission under Peel was set up to investigate the causes of disturbances and to make recommendation *for the solution of the issue It submitted its report in 1937 It observed that* the Arab Jewish problems were so complicated and their interests so conflicting that there was no other way to make a happy solution of the problem except a tripartite division of the country The Holy Places were to remain permanently under British control Galilee and the coastal plains were to form a Jewish sovereign state The remainder areas were to be joined to Trans Jordan an Arab state The Commission recommended the conclusion of a military treaty by Britain with the Arab and Jewish states The scheme proposed by the Royal (Peel) Commission met with severe criticism from all quarters

5. Woodhead Commission In 1938, England appointed another Commission under Woodhead to examine the practicability of the scheme suggested by the Peel Commission *During the course of its investigation* fresh disturbances broke out in Palestine Strifes, murders and loots between the two

communities became events of almost daily routine. A British army was despatched to Palestine for the maintenance of peace. In October 1938 the Arabs occupied Bethlehem and Jerusalem. They openly declared that they would continue the war until their demands were accepted by Great Britain. In the meanwhile the Woodhead Commission submitted its report and decisively opposed the partition scheme which was therefore abandoned.

6. London Conference 1939. To find out a peaceful settlement between the Arabs and Jews a Conference was convened at London in February, 1939 in which the Jew and Arab representatives were invited. But as the Arab representatives refused to sit with the Jews, no solution could be found for the Palestine Problem.

7. British Solution. Britain announced its own solution of the problem in May 1939. Palestine was not to become a Jewish state but an independent state in which both the Jews and the Arabs were to share authority. Such a state was to be established after 10 years. The Jewish immigration was to be limited to 10,000 annually for a period of five years. Restrictions were imposed on the acquisition of land by the Jews. This solution was rejected by the Commission of the League which declared it a violation of the Mandate itself.

Due to the persecution of the Jews by Hitler in Germany, during the subsequent years the number of Jewish immigrants into Palestine greatly increased. In spite of its best efforts the British Government could not stop the immigration of the jews, who had absolutely no other alternative left except to come to Palestine.

Palestine problem was shelved for the time being when the Second World War broke out. The British Government was worried about its defences in the Near East, and its hold over the oil supplies. It was not willing to displease the Arabs. To conciliate the Arabs who were resentful of the British policies in Palestine, it recognised independence of Syria and Lebanon in 1941.

During the War the Jews fully co-operated with the Allies while the Arabs showed more or less neutral attitude. At the end of the war Britain realized that she was no longer strong enough to tackle the Palestine problem. She announced her intention to get out of Palestine. She threw the issue into the lap of the United Nations. On May 14, 1948 the Jewish Agency declared the new state of Israel and it was hastily recognized by U.S.A. To conclude with Carr "the contradiction between the promise given to the Jews and the vaguer undertaking given to the Arabs (which was rightly or wrongly, assumed to include Palestine) laid up serious trouble for the future."

ARAB NATIONALISM

Impact of Turkish Domination

Arab Nationalism was the direct outcome of the Turkish domination of Arabs. The Arabs had never been able to reconcile themselves to the Turkish rule.

They were opposed to the right of the Sultan of Turkey to be the Caliph, the successor of Prophet They felt that Hussein, the Grand Sheriff of Mecca who was of the purest Arab descent, had a better title to that position

Efforts by Hussein

On the outbreak of the First World War when the British repulsed the Turks from the Suez Canal, the Arab nationalism was stirred For the first time they thought of overthrowing the Turkish rule Hussein, who dreamed of setting up an independent Arab empire stretching from the Mediterranean to Persian gulf led in this direction He was encouraged by the Britishers, who wanted to exploit the Arab hatred of Turks to safeguard their interests in the Near East Britain helped the Arabs with money, arms and supplies In 1916 Hussein announced himself as the true Caliph and declared freedom of the whole Arab race The Arab soldiers were trained by the Britishers In 1918, the Arab forces captured Damascus, the capital of Syria

Impact of Peace Settlement

The peace settlement of 1919-20 gave a shock to the nationalism in Arab Contrary to their promise of granting independence to the Arab countries after war the Allies power divided Arab area into four parts under separate governments France received Mandate over Syria, Great Britain received mandate over Palestine and Mesopotamia (Iraq) Only Hedjaz was allowed to remain as an independent Arab Kingdom under Hussein

After the peace settlement the nationalism in Arab took a violent shape They started a struggle for political liberty as well as better standard of living Amongst the Arab's it created a desire to break the bonds of imperialist chains by revolting against the political supremacy and commercial dominance of the foreign powers It also created a desire among them to absorb the political ideals of the western powers They tried to master the western the techniques with a view to drive out the Western powers This started the commencement of educational and social reforms and introduction of public welfare schemes in the area

Aggressive Policy of Western Nations

Another factor which gave rise to Arab nationalism during inter-war period was the aggressive policy of the western nations Under pressure of circumstances, the Western powers had made contradictory commitments to the Arabs and Jews during the war which could not be fulfilled after the war For example, England had promised a homeland to the Jews in Palestine but undertaken with the Arabs not to grant this state without their consent The problem of Palestine evoked much racial strife and blood-shed during the inter-war period

Rivalry over Oil

The strong rivalry among the powers over oil in the Middle East after World War I also promoted the Arab nationalism. When France and Britain concluded the San Remo Pact, U.S.A. launched a violent protest against it on the ground that it violated the assurance of equal economic rights and privileges given to the Allies in the mandated territories. Similarly, Soviet Russia developed interest in the Middle East. Thus, the Middle East became a theatre of acute international friction for the control of its oils after the war. Sometimes the consuls and political agents of these governments tried to exercise influence in the fields not meant for them. For example, they organised medical services, settled disputes between tribal chiefs and in some cases acted informally as judges in local controversies. This created distrust in the mind of the Arabs. They developed a hatred for the foreigners.

Turkey under Mustafa Kamal

The emergence of Turkey as a powerful nation under Mustafa Kamal, the father of modern Turkey, also gave impetus to the Arab nationalism. Kamal had secularized the Turkish society and granted full freedom of conscience. He introduced a number of social, educational and administrative reforms. Hence an efficient, homogeneous and balanced Turkish society was created. This encouraged the Arab nations not only to challenge the western domination but also to undermine the native vested interest and feudalism.

Due to all these factors the states of the Middle East felt the need of unity against Western imperialism as well as against the aggressive attitude of the Jews. This found its expression for the first time in the Saadabad Pact concluded by Persia, Iraq, Turkey and Afghanistan in 1937.

Great Britain wanted the Arab countries to present a joint front during the war. The creation of the Arab League in March 1945 was an extension of that effort. The representatives of Syria, Egypt, Iraq, Saudi-Arabia and Trans-Jordan signed the Arab League Covenant at a conference in Cairo. The Arab League aimed to improve the mutual relations among the Arab states who agreed to recognise sovereignty and independence of each other and to help each other against the enemy and help in the economic and cultural development of the Arab states. A Council composed of the representatives of the Arab States was set up. It took decisions by majority vote. At least two meetings of the Council were held every year. Although the League was formed by the signatory states, other Arab states were free to join it.

ANGLO-EGYPTIAN RELATIONS 1918-1936

British Occupation of Egypt

Egypt occupies a vital and important position in the Middle East. It is situated at the north-eastern corner of African continent. It is flanked on the north

by the Mediterranean and on the east by the Red Sea The two seas are connected by the Suez Canal Realizing the strategic importance of Egypt as a vital link with India Britain purchased 176,602 shares in the last quarter of the 19th century from Khedive Ismail for four million pounds When the nationalist movement in Egypt took a violent turn in 1882 Britain made an armed intervention and established its hold on Egyptian government Egypt remained under British protection till 1907 When the First World War broke out Britain turned Egypt into a British protectorate The Legislative Assembly was suspended and the political aspirations of the Egyptians were suppressed

Role of Zaghlul Pasha

In 1917 the principle of self-determination announced by President Wilson exercised profound influence on the young Egyptians They started an agitation for independence under the leadership of Saad Pasha Zaghlul When the war was about to end, Zaghlul Pasha sought permission to lead a deputation to the Paris Peace Conference This was dismissed by the British Government, and Pasha was banished to Malta in 1919

British Declaration of Egypt Policy 1922

In 1919 a terrible anti-British riot broke out in Egypt The British Government set free Zaghlul Immediately she set up a Commission under Lord Milner (1919) to investigate the situation and make recommendations for satisfying the Egyptians In the light of the recommendations of Milner Commission, the British Government made a declaration regarding its Policy towards Egypt on February 28, 1922 The chief provisions of the declaration were

1. Sovereign state. The British Protectorate over Egypt was terminated and Egypt was declared to be an independent sovereign state

2. British Privileges Until a treaty was concluded, certain special privileges of Britain were preserved, with regard to (i) security of the communications of the British Empire, (ii) the defence of Egypt, against all foreign aggression or interference, direct or indirect; (iii) protection of foreign interest in Egypt and the protection of minorities, and (iv) the protection of Sudan

This declaration was soon followed by the British pronouncement that "interference in the affairs of Egypt by any foreign power would be regarded by Britain as a menace to her own security"

The Egyptians did not like the British Declaration because their independence was greatly limited by the reservations However, they were not in a position to oppose Great Britain As Langsam says "The new arrangement irked the nationalists, but they were powerless to resist it" On March 15, 1922 Sultan Faud was proclaimed the King of Egypt In April 1923 a new constitution was promulgated In January 1924 the first parliamentary elections under the

new constitution were held. The Wafd Party returned in majority and Zaghlul Pasha became the Prime Minister. Now Zaghlul Pasha started negotiation with Great Britain regarding complete independence of Egypt, withdrawal of British army from Britain and Union of Sudan and Egypt. But no agreement could be reached. The Wafd Party started a campaign of terror and murder to extract concessions. On November 19, 1924, Sir Lee Stack, the Governor-General of Sudan and Commander-in-Chief of the Egyptian forces was murdered in the Street of Cairo. The Britishers found an opportunity to force the Ward out of Cabinet by presenting her with an ultimatum which contained terms impossible to comply. There was a comparative lull in Egyptian national movement during the next few years. This was mainly due to the sudden demise of Zaghlul Pasha, the father of Egyptian nationalism.

British Declaration of 1929

In May 1929, the British government redefined her policy towards Egypt and made the following declarations. By the declaration of 1922, his Majesty's Government reserved certain matters for its own determination, but even in these cases it was the desire of H.M.'s Government to act with and, where possible, through the Egyptian Government, respecting, in the large measures, the liberties and independence, which by the same declaration they conceded to Egypt.

In 1929 the Labour Government came to power in Great Britain. It prepared a draft treaty, which was submitted to Egypt. This draft treaty marked a further step in the direction of independence but it did not satisfy the Nationalist leader, Mustafa Nahas Pasha who wanted complete independence for Egypt. In 1929-30 riots broke out in Egypt. The King dissolved the Parliament and invited Sidky Pasha to assume office, who drafted a new constitution. In 1930 after some time differences developed between King of Egypt and Sidky Pasha, and the latter resigned. Nahas Pasha again came to power and got the constitution of 1930 abrogated.

The Italian invasion of Ethiopia introduced a new factor in the Anglo-Egyptian relations. Visualising possible involvement in war with Italy, Great Britain thought it wise to reach an agreement with Egypt. Wafd party also felt that in view of the possibility of Egypt turning into a battle-ground it was better to come to some understanding with Great Britain.

Treaty of 1936

An Anglo-Egyptian Treaty of Alliance was signed in London in August 1936. This ended British military occupation of Egypt. However, she was allowed to maintain air bases and fly R.A.F. planes over Egypt for training purposes. The ground troops of Britain were allowed to be stationed in special zones along the Suez Canal for a period of 20 years, and at the naval base of Alexandria for a period of 8 years. However, all British troops were to be

withdrawn from the interior of the country Both the states agreed to help each other against any aggression England agreed to support Egypt for the membership of the League Egyptian officials were given a share in the administration of Sudan Egypt agreed not to enter into any treaty with a foreign power which might be opposed to this alliance Britain undertook to help Egypt to secure the abolition of the Capitulations, i e, this rights of extarritoriality enjoyed by the nations of principal foreign powers in Egypt The treaty was to remain in force for 20 years It partially resolved the then existing problems in Egypt Yet it was a long way to go before Egypt could achieve full freedom Egypt was admitted to the League of Nations in 1937

When the Second World War broke out, Egypt did not declare war on the Axis till 1945 However, she cut off her diplomatic relations with Germany In 1940-41, when a joint German and Italian attack on Egypt was imminent, she was compelled to accept the help of British army But when the Axis powers won victories in 1941, the Egyptian leaders became lukewarm in supporting the British war efforts Hence in February 1942, Britain compelled the King to appoint Pasha as Prime Minister and Military Governor

During the rest of the war period Egypt under Nahas Pasha remained loyal to the British A few years after the war Egypt attained complete indepen dence All British troops were withdrawn from the Egyptian soil Thus during the period 1912 to 1945, Egypt was under subjugation of Britain who played an important part in the making and unmaking of her governments Due to the growing militant nationalism Great Britain had to concede concessions to the Egyptians from time to time

OIL DIPLOMACY

Twentieth century marked the beginning of struggle between great powers in Middle East over the possession of gigantic oil reserves which were discovered there in the early years of the century Great Britain was the first country to get the concession in this regard In 1908 the Anglo-Iranian Oil Company was formed The Government of Iran did not interfere in its commercial management As Russia also coveted the oil of the Middle East she entered into an agreement with the British Government in 1907 by which Iran was partitioned into spheres of influence and areas of exploitation, the northern province of Iran went to Russia while the Southern one was given to Great Britain

The importance of oil was brought home to the Western powers during World War I As a result strong rivalry started among the foreign powers in the Middle East over the oil resources U S A felt that its own output of oil would not be able to meet the growing demands at home and she started looking for the oil in the Middle East She launched a violent protest against the San Remo Pact concluded between Great Britain and France on the ground that it

violated the assurance of equal economic rights and privileges of the Allied Powers in the mandated territories. Numerous notes were exchanged on this issue between the governments of U.S.A. and Great Britain. Finally, in March, 1925 a bargain was struck by which the American Companies secured 23-2/3 participation in the Turkish Petroleum Company.

Before the outbreak of war, Russia had secured certain concession in the Middle East. After the Revolution of 1917, the Bolsheviks unilaterally renounced the concessions secured by the Czarist imperialism in Iran. Russia announced the cancellation of all Iranian debts. She promised not to interfere in the internal affairs of Iran. Thus Middle East escaped Soviet intervention during the war period. Control over oil production in the Middle East mainly rested with the British, though the French, Dutch and American oil companies also secured a share in it. In 1928 the Standard Oil Company of California acquired oil concessions in the Shekhdom of Bahrain. In May 1933 the Company obtained concessions over an extensive area in Saudi Arabia.

Oil companies played a significant role in the political life of Middle East. They concluded agreements with the local chiefs in the region and the land-owners of the oil-fields. They paid them huge amounts of money as royalties, which was mainly spent on rail roads, motor cars, aeroplanes, palaces, jewels, etc. Chiefs paid no attention to the welfare of the people. Though a few thousand peasants were able to secure work in the oil installations, but the condition of the majority of them was miserable. This fostered a feeling of discontent among the people who were not prepared to allow the country to be exploited by the foreign powers though they themselves remained poor.

The British Government allowed its companies to organise medical services, settle disputes between tribal chiefs and in some cases even to act informally as judges in the local controversies. Thus the British Consuls and political agents started actions which were beyond their usual duties. This created distrust in the minds of the people who felt that their country was being treated as a 'pawn' in the game of power politics.

In the autumn of 1944 when Soviet Russia demanded re-instalment of the oil concessions of 1916 for the northern provinces the international struggle for oil entered a new phase. Russia had agreed to the cancellation of this concession by the Russo-Iranian Treaty of Friendship concluded in February 1921. She pleaded that denial of this concession to her would be treated as an unfriendly act. The British and U.S. Government encouraged Prime Minister said to postpone this inflammatory question. He obtained permission from the Majlis of Iran to postpone all discussions regarding oil concessions till foreign troops were withdrawn from the Iranian soil. This led to a lot of resentment in Moscow. The Russian authorities began to encourage a separatist movement in Azerbaijan and other northern provinces.

When the Tripartite treaty expired on March 2, the British and American troops retired However, the Soviet troops stayed and withdrew only after the Iran government entered into an agreement with the Soviet Union for the establishment of a jointly-owned company to explore and exploit the northern provinces of Iran On October 22, 1947 the Majlis declared the proposal with its policy of exploration programme financed out of its own resources The Iranian Majlis passed a law nationalizing the oil industry on April 28, 1951 In October all the foreign employees of the A I C C were withdrawn both from the oil fields and from Abadan refinery

The British government objected to the unilateral repudiation of the Treaty of 1933 She asked the Iran government to submit the issue to arbitration according to the terms of the aforesaid treaty This request was turned down by Iran on the ground that an international body like Hague Court, had no right to interfere in the domestic affairs of Iran Britain took the matter to the International Court which directed the parties to maintain *status quo* Following this decision Iran withdrew from the membership of the Court The U S A attempt at intervention also failed In October 1951 Great Britain took the issue to the Security Council but nothing came out of it

QUESTIONS FOR EXERCISE

1 Discuss the nature of Palestine problems Describe the various attempts that were made to solve these problems between 1919 and 1945

2 "The contradiction between the promise given to the Jews and the vague undertaking given to the Arabs laid up serious trouble for the future " (Carr) How did Britain tackle the problem in Palestine as the Mandatory power

3 Discuss the factors which contributed to the growth of Arab nationalism from 1927 to 1930 Also examine its impact on the Middle East politics during this period

4 Explain the Anglo-Egyptian relations from 1918 to 1936

5 What do you understand by 'Oil Diplomacy' ? In what ways did it influence International Relations in the Middle East ?

26

British Foreign Policy

BRITISH FOREIGN POLICY

According to Palmer and Perkins "Geography, sea power, trade, balance of power, imperial interests these have been the traditional bases of British foreign policy, and every British statesman of the past few centuries have been conscious of them. On the whole British diplomacy has sought to promote the interests of Britain in the light of these underlying realities, and it has done so with a continuity that is one of the outstanding characteristics of British foreign policy."

Change in Foreign Policy

In the pre-World War I period, the preservation of 'Balance of Power' and 'mastery over the seas' have been the two outstanding objectives of British Foreign Policy. After First World War the emergence of Japan gave a serious blow to the British interests in Far East. U.S.A. destroyed the well accepted British principle of a two navy standard by forcing her to relinquish it at the Washington Conference. The war resulted in decline of trade, depreciation of the currency and increase in unemployment figures. This affected Britain's exports and production. The people of Asia and the Middle East became violent against imperialist countries and started freedom movement. As the Commonwealth countries sought to play their own role in the world politics British hold on these countries weakened. The problem of reparation created a vicious economic reaction. It led to the depression of thirties and adoption of preference to Empire trade at the Ottawa Conferences. All these factors brought about a change in the foreign policy of Great Britain. Now the chief aim of the British foreign policy was to secure cooperation of the Commonwealth countries, strengthen friendship to with U.S.A., make disarmament policy effective which was essential for her world-trade and economic revival, and support to the world organisation for regulating international relations peacefully.

1. Relations with France. Although Great Britain and France had fought together during the First World War, soon differences cropped up between the two. At the time of the Peace Settlement, England and U.S.A. could not accept

the Treaty of Versailles, due to Senate's refusal to ratify the Treaty, she backed out from this guarantee England also felt that she was not in a position to give this guarantee France felt aggrieved and the relations between the two countries were strained

The attitude of France and England towards Germany was also different. While France wanted to crush Germany so that she may not able to attack her again, Great Britain considered a prosperous Germany essential for civilization As Germany was a good customer of British goods she was keen to restore Germany to her normal conditions in the interest of her trade In 1923 when the French and Belgium troops entered the Ruhr Valley, Great Britain objected to it

During the years 1924 to 1929, Great Britain tried to meet almost all the demands of France. She met the French demand for security by guaranteeing the *status quo* in the Rhineland against possible aggression from Germany Germany renounced all designs to recover Alsace-Lorraine and was even welcomed into the League of Nations as a member However, the public opinion in England did not feel happy over this subordination of British Foreign Policy to the interests of France Britain did not like the prestige enjoyed by France in the League of Nations She expected her government to play the role of an impartial arbiter between France and Germany, and not that of 'shining second' to France Consequently, in 1929 the British Government violated the Truce of Locarno

When Hitler came to power in Germany, England continued her old policy of isolation She wanted to check France from gaining predominance The revival of Germany was essential That is why two months after the Stress Conference of April 1935 (where England along with France and Italy had denounced Nazi rearmament and the implied threat to peace in Europe), Great Britain entered it not the Anglo-German Navy Treaty by which Germany was permitted to have a navy to the tune of 35% of the British naval strength This open recognition to the illegal German rearmament was greatly resented by France who described it as a 'stupid' and 'perfidious' betrayal of the Stressa Front

During the Abyssinian war while England favoured stiff attitude towards Italy, France did not want to annoy Mussolini. Hence France refused to support Great Britain whole-heartedly. She enforced the economic sanctions recommended by League only half-heartedly As a result, Italy succeeded in achieving her objectives.

On the occasion of the Munich Crisis in September 1938, the two countries acted together and gave a guarantee to Poland, Greece and Romania Now France began to lean more and more on England The two declared war against Germany on the question of Danzig when Hitler attacked Poland in 1939

2. Relations with Russia. Great Britain and Russia entered the First World War as allies. After the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917, Russia started negotiations with the Central Powers and signed an armistice at Brest Litovsk in March 1918. After the war England entered *into a trade agreement with Russia*, who gave specific understanding that she would stop all propaganda against Great Britain. However, Soviet Russia continued to follow a policy inimical to the British interests. She encouraged general strike in England which greatly offended the sentiments of the British people.

In Munich Crisis, Soviet Russia offered to join hands with Britain to fight against Hitler but as the offer was not accepted by Great Britain and Soviet Russia together these efforts did not yield any result. As D.N. Pritt said "the Western democracies were not in earnest either in desiring the friendship and cooperation of the Soviet Union ... that they had no genuine resolve to resist Fascism, which they preferred to the spread of Socialism; that they had a very strong desire to maintain the strength of Hitler and Mussolini, to save them from internal collapse, and to keep on friendly terms with them ... and that they were also pursuing with more or less consistency a policy of diverting by one means or another the force and aggressiveness of Hitler eastwards against the Soviet Union, in order to save themselves from having to face his aggression in the West." On August 23, 1939, Soviet Union entered into a non-aggression pact with Germany for ten years. The relations between Soviet Union and Great Britain remained cold till the latter was attacked by Germany in 1941. Then the two countries became partners in a common war with Germany.

3. Relations with Italy. *In the years immediately following the peace* Agreement England's relations with Italy were quite cordial. The two became the guarantors of the provisions of Locarno Pact of 1925. They joined hands at Stressa Conference in April, 1935 to denounce Germany's programme of rearmament. After the Abyssinian war, however, the relations between the two became bitter. Mussolini resented the British condemnation of the Italian action, this drove Italy into the arms of Germany. During the subsequent years Great Britain made many efforts to win back Italy. Even on the eve of the outbreak of Second World War, England sent Chamberlain and Lord Hali fax to Rome. But, when the war broke out, Italy fought on the side of Germany.

4. Relations with Germany. In the post-world war the attitude of Great Britain towards Germany was one of sympathy. She wanted Germany to be strong to check the French hegemony, and to secure a market for British goods. She pleaded fixation of reparations according to German capacity of payment. She expressed its disapproval of the action when France occupied the Ruhr Valley. She even tried to bring Germany into the League of Nations. It was mainly due to her efforts that Germany was admitted to the League Council. This sympathetic attitude of Great Britain towards Germany's continued even during the initial years of Hitler's rule. Germany strength was an insurance

against Communism Hence England preferred to develop friendly relations with Germany rather than Soviet Russia

In 1935 was concluded Anglo-German Navy Treaty by which Germany was permitted to have navy to the extent of 35% of the British naval strength This impelled recognition of Germany's right to rearm herself in violation of the Peace Settlement This policy of appeasement towards Germany continued from 1935 to 1939 After Munich Pact and occupation of Prague by the Germans on March 15, 1939 a dramatic change was witnessed in the foreign policy of Great Britain On March 17, 1939 Chamberlain promised British resistance "to the utmost of its power to any power which attempted to dominate the world by force" On August 25, 1939 Great Britain signed a treaty of mutual assistance with Poland England entered the War in fulfilment of the obligations imposed by this treaty

5. Efforts for Disarmament. During the inter-war period Great Britain supported all efforts for disarmament She summoned a number of Disarmament Conferences and took an active part in making them a success The Locarno Pact signed in 1925 guaranteed the frontiers of Belgium and France with Germany and Germany agreed to refer all disputes between her and other parties to the pact Great Britain was one of the signatories to the Four Power Pact of 1933 which enjoined on the members the duty "to consult together on all questions pertaining to them and, within the framework of the League of Nations, try to maintain peace to safeguard the decision which may be taken by the League"

In the Naval Conference of London (1930) England was one of the three powers, the other two being U S A and Japan In 1930 Rhineland was evacuated by the Allies under the influence of Great Britain, though they were entitled to keep the same upto 1935

6 Relations with the League. England had taken an active part in the establishment of the League, but she did not take any active part in its work As League was dominated by France and her allies England became indifferent towards it She embarked on a policy of isolation from European politics, as far as possible Even at the time of Abyssinian war she was forced to adopt a stiff attitude towards Italy by the pressure of public opinion The economic sanctions imposed by the League of Nations were enforced mainly at the insistence of Great Britain Thus, during the inter-war period England adopted a policy of shameful escape from war Admitting the failure of British policy Chamberlain, the British Prime Minister observed · "This is a sad day for all of us, and to none is it sadder than to me Everything that I have worked for, everything that I hoped for, everything that I have believed in during my public life, has crashed into ruins There is only one thing left for me to do, that is to devote what strength and powers I have to forwarding the victory of the cause for which we have to sacrifice so much"

BRITISH POLICY TOWARDS NAZI GERMANY

The foreign policy of Great Britain had undergone slight changes in the years following the Peace Settlement. It underwent further changes after the emergence of Hitler in Germany. This change in foreign policy of Great Britain has been described as 'policy of appeasement'. Under this policy Great Britain persued a policy of concession to the Italian and German dictators. This policy was the handiwork of Chamberlain. During this period Great Britain felt that if the grievances of Italy and Germany were removed an eternal peace will prevail in Europe. She felt that peace would ensure her greater trade and profits. Following were the main causes for adopting policy of appeasement :

1. Fear of Communism. Great Britain was scared of Communist danger. The British clash of interests with Russia in the Middle East, China and Europe and Russia's policy of encouraging general strike and labour unrest in England, made her hostile to Russia. She was willing to support any country fighting against Russian danger. This attitude of Russophobia was fully exploited by Germany, Japan and Italy.

2. Balance of Power. England was keen to preserve her traditional policy of 'balance of power'. She felt that Japan, U.S.S.R. and Germany would check each other and their mutual conflicts will exhaust all of them. She was sure that Germany and her partners would be able to liquidate the greatest threat to the British bourgeoisie, the Communist danger. Hence, Great Britain allowed Germany to re-arm herself in violation of the Treaty of Versailles and Locarno Pact. She did not oppose German aggressions in Austria and Czechoslovakia and encouraged Japan to occupy Manchuria. She did not adopt any stiff attitude towards Italy's occupation of Abyssinia either. The Axis powers destroyed the 'balance of power' which Great Britain so earnestly wanted to maintain.

3. Anglo-French Differences. After the war sharp differences had cropped up between the two countries on questions pertaining to German recovery, disarmament, reparation, security etc. England was sympathetically disposed towards Germany because she felt that a weak Germany would be an open invitation to Communist expansion. Therefore, she favoured the idea of strengthening Germany by relaxing provisions of the Peace Treaty. This attitude was dictated both by expediency and self-interest. But after the emergence of Hitler, this policy of appeasement continued on grounds of expediency. It was on this ground that great Britain concluded the Anglo-German treaty in 1935. After 1937, this policy of appeasement was continued to gain time for war preparations.

4. Internal Weakness. The ever-deteriorating economic conditions in Britain created the danger of Communism in her mind, and to check that danger she supported Germany, Italy and Japan.

BRITISH POLICY TOWARDS HITLER

Anglo-German Naval Treaty

During the initial period of Hitler's rule in Germany, Great Britain adopted very sympathetic attitude In the dictatorship of Hitler, Great Britain saw an insurance against the communist threat of Russia Hitler had clearly stated in *Mein Kampf* "If we speak today of new territory in Europe, we can primarily think only of Russia and the border states" Great Britain preferred to develop friendly relations with Germany Hence, in 1935 she concluded the Anglo-German Naval Treaty by which Germany's right to have navy to the extent of 35% of the British navy was accepted, in violation of the Treaty of Versailles and the Locarno Pact

Committee of Non-Intervention

Great Britain did not intervene in 1936 when Germany and Italy jointly entered in the Spanish Civil War on the pretext of liberating Spain from the influence of the Communist Russia who was supporting the government of Spain She even did not make any effort to check the war through the League of Nations Instead, a 'Committee of Non-Intervention' was formed in London in 1936 for the maintenance of peace in Europe Instead of settling the issue this Committee complicated it and thus provided time to Germany and her ally Italy to establish Franco Government in Spain When Soviet Union suggested the withdrawal of foreign volunteers from Spain, it was not supported by Great Britain Thus Great Britain approved the foreign intervention in the Spanish Civil War

Czech Episode

In 1938 when Hitler decided to occupy Austria and Czechoslovakia England helped the cause of Germany by making Eden resign from the cabinet because of his anti-fascist views Again, when Roosevelt the President of U S A proposed a conference of neutral states for the preservation of world peace, Great Britain opposed the proposal and thereby foiled an important attempt at maintenance of world peace When Schuschnigg, the Austrian Vice-Chancellor appealed to Britain for help against German attack, she did not take any course of action which might expose his country to dangers Similarly, when Germany undertook an expedition against Czechoslovakia, Great Britain rendered no assistance to the latter On the contrary, when Russia proposed to call a conference of the Western states against Hitler, it was summarily rejected by Chamberlain During the Czech crisis, however, England tried everything possible to preserve the peace She pleaded with Germany to be less rigid in her demand regarding Sudetenland She put pressure upon Czech Government to accept the German demand so that she may not go ahead with her plan of Czech attack, she impressed on France to adopt a less rigid attitude on Czechoslovakia so that Czechs may not go to war on the basis of Franco-Cezch Treaty

The Munich Pact

The Munich Pact was drafted on the basis of what had already been decided at a Conference by England, France and Germany. The Czechoslovakia episode marked a remarkable change in the British Foreign Policy after World War I, for the first time Great Britain undertook a commitment to Central Europe by accepting the obligation to guarantee to protect the remnant of Czechoslovakia. This responsibility devolved on Great Britain as a member of the International Commission which was set up under the Munich Pact.

The Czech episode was an outstanding example of the British policy of appeasement towards Germany. England, along with France, forced Czechoslovakia to cede the portions demanded by Germany. But when Chamberlain met Hitler with the letter of consent from the Czech Government, Hitler increased his demands and wanted occupation of Sudetenland by 1st October, 1938. He refused to give German security for the rest of Czechoslovakia unless demands of Poland and Hungary were accepted. Chamberlain felt quite embarrassed and on the intervention of Mussolini a meeting of the representatives of Britain, France, Italy and Germany was arranged at Munich, which resulted in the Munich Pact.

Instead of establishing peace, the Munich Pact gave impetus to the aggressive designs of Hitler. Britain kept isolated. She was not in favour of going to war over the fate of Czechoslovakia, which did not directly concern her. Further, Hitler's demand for self-determination of the Sudetens did not appear unjust to the British.

The German armies captured Prague, the capital of Czechoslovakia in violation of the Pact of Munich. Chamberlain denounced Hitler's adventurism, and proceeded to accord guarantees to Poland against Germany and Greece and Romania against Italy. She also started negotiations with Russia, these negotiations could not make much progress. This pushed Russia closer to Germany and resulted in a Non-Aggression Pact between the two.

Failure of British Policy

As late as July 1939, Britain attempted to conclude a twenty-five-year defence pact with Germany and offered to provide large loans and return her colonies to Germany in return for a promise that Hitler would not invade Poland. But all these efforts failed. In September 1939, when Hitler invaded Poland, England declared war against Germany in fulfilment of her obligations. Thus the British policy of appeasement towards Germany failed to prevent war and secure peace in Europe. In his speech before the House of Commons on September 3, 1939 Chamberlain said, "This is a sad day for all of us, and to none is it sadder than to me. Everything that I have believed in during my public life, has crashed into ruins. There is only one thing left for me to do; that is to devote what strength and powers I have to forwarding the victory

of the cause for which we have to sacrifice so much I cannot tell what part I may be allowed to play myself, I trust I may live to see the day when Hitlerism has been destroyed and a liberated Europe has been re-established"

Thus the policy of appeasement persued by Great Britain towards Germany destroyed the European balance of power, annihilated the framework of security *and led to the Second World War*

QUESTIONS FOR EXERCISE

1 Discuss the Foreign Policy of England from 1919 to 1939 How did it affect the Anglo-French relations before the Second World War ?

2 *Describe the Policy of appeasement followed by Great Britain during* 1930-1939 How far was it responsible for world catastrophe ?

27

Foreign Policy of United States of America

FOREIGN POLICY OF U.S.A. UPTO 1918

According to Palmer and Perkins, "The foreign policy of the United States of America, like that of any State is shaped largely by geographical and historical considerations, by her political and social system, by her economic strength and military power, by her relative power position, by the policies of other states and by the world environment in which now she lives."

Policy of Isolation

Before the out-break of the War, for centuries U.S.A. had followed a policy of 'isolation'. This policy of isolation was first advocated by President Washington, in his famous farewell address. He warned his countrymen to avoid 'entangling alliances' with the governments of Europe. Psychologically the American people were inclined towards a policy of neutralism and non-alignment. They felt that a common man gains nothing from the war while he pays heavy price. The wars and the large armies that were essential to conduct the war, involved huge manpower and resources. These could be provided at the cost of constructive activities. Therefore, the U.S. Government tried to promote maximum economic development at the cost of political glory and power.

Munro Doctrine

With the enunciation of the 'Munro Doctrine', in 1823 the American foreign policy moved a step further in the direction of non-intervention. President Munro declared : "In the wars of the European Powers, in matters relating to themselves we have never taken any part, nor does it comfort with out policy to do so." "The United States had not intervened, and never would intervene, in wars in Europe; but they could not, on the other hand, in the interest of their own peace and happiness, allow the allied European powers to extend their political system to any part of America, and try to intervene in the independence of the South American Republics. We should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety." For about a century America continued to base her foreign policy on this doctrine.

Watchful waiting

U S A adopted an attitude of 'watchful waiting' when the First World War broke out But the U S protested against German policy of destroying enemy ships found in the waters around the British Isles without regard to the safety of those abroad In May 1915, an English unarmed liner the Lusitania was destroyed by the German submarines This resulted in the death of 1200 men, of which 128 were Americans America was greatly shocked by this barbaric act Americans pressed President Wilson to declare war against Germany However, President Wilson became satisfied with a guarantee from Germany that in future "Liners will not be sunk by our submarines without warning and without safety of the lives of non-combatants" During the next nine months nothing untoward happened

War Against Germany

In January 1917, the German Government declared that 'it would sink at sight all ships, neutral as well as belligerent, in certain waters about the British Isles and in the mediterranean Sea' At this President Wilson at once cut off diplomatic relations with Germany On April 2, 1917 Wilson declared 'The world must be made safe for democracy, its peace must be planted upon the foundations of political liberty We have no selfish ends to serve We desire no conquest, no domination We seek no war indemnities for ourselves, no material compensation for the sacrifice we shall freely make We are but one of the champions of the rights of mankind" On April 6, 1917 U S A joined war against Germany

This tilted the balance in favour of Allies, U S A placed at their disposal not only reservoir of man-power but also unlimited money, food-stuffs, minerals, manufactures, shipyards and material resources of every kind The Allies came out victorious from the war only by the help of U S A

FOREIGN POLICY OF U S A. DURING 1920-1941

Paris Peace Conference

After America emerged as the economic leader of the world she played a very important role at the Paris Peace Conference It was largely by the efforts of the American President that the League of Nations was created However, the American Senate felt that the treaty of Versailles was not in keeping with the declared war aims of U S A They feared that it would involve constant American intervention not only in European politics but also in world politics In the words of Walter Lippmann, the Americans felt "for what we were asked to give to our Allies, we were to receive nothing from them" Therefore, the American Government refused to give France the promised guarantee against Germany The Democratic Government was ousted and the Republican Government came in office in the elections of 1920

Republican Foreign Policy

In 1921 the Republican President Hardinge in U.S.A. declared foreign policy in these words: "We seek no part in directing the destinies of the world. We are ready to associate ourselves with the nations of the world, great and small for conference and counsel for the suggestion of mediation, conciliation and arbitration; but every commitment must be made in the exercise of our national sovereignty." Republicans adopted the policy of 'Cooperation without entangling alliances'. Though she had not ratified the treaty of Versailles, U.S.A. was not averse to assisting in the settlement of the question of German reparations. She was responsible for the arrangements known as Dawes Plan (1924). She participated in various non-political activities of the League.

American Foreign Policy in Inter-War Period

1. Cooperation with League. Though she could not become a member of the League due to rejection of the Treaty of Versailles by the American Senate, the United States continued to co-operate with the activities of the League. The American Government used to appoint observers to attend the meetings of the League who represented the American views though they were not permitted to vote. U.S. observers were attached with the Committees of the League concerning traffic in women and children, the opium trade and health. U.S.A. attended the conferences held for disarmament and betterment of labour conditions. By March 1930, the American delegates had taken part in 22 such conferences. An American representative was deputed to work with the League Council. During the Manchurian crisis a number of distinguished American judges served as judges on the Permanent Court of International Justice.

2. Interest in Disarmament. During the inter-war period U.S.A. showed interest in the efforts for disarmament, particularly in naval disarmament. Toping a lead in its direction she called a Disarmament Conference at Washington, which fixed ratios for the great powers in capital ships and aeroplane carriers. In 1927 at Geneva President Coolidge called another conference to consider the principle of limitation to smaller crafts such as cruisers, destroyers and submarines. This conference failed to achieve any results. In Naval Conferences held at London in 1930 and 1932 U.S.A. participated.

United States cooperated with the Preparatory Commission for the Disarmament Conference set up by the League Council. She took part in the General Disarmament Conference held at Geneva in February 1932. She offered to co-operate with the League in the adoption of a general plan for disarmament in 1933. She attended the London Economic Conference of 1933. Though it was mainly an economic conference it also examined the possibilities of mutual understanding of the different countries regarding restriction of armaments.

3 *Policy of Neutrality.* After the World War I, U S A again adopted her traditional policy of neutrality in the European affairs After the emergence of Hitler this policy particularly became pronounced A Neutrality Act was passed in August, 1935 to forbid the export of arms, ammunition and implements of war from any place in U S A to any part of belligerent state U S A took another step in this direction by adopting the principle of 'cash and carry basis' for sale of armaments in 1937 By the Neutrality Act of 1939, the President could name the states through proclamation in case of war between two foreign states Such a proclamation made it unlawful for the U S vessels to carry any passengers or articles or materials to any state named in the proclamation It was also unlawful for the citizens of U S A to travel on any vessel belonging to the state named in the proclamation Even foreign loans were forbidden to belligerent governments

4. Settlement of War Debts and Reparations. U S A displayed lack of interest in the political affairs of Europe But she followed a policy of close co-operation with the European nations in the economic field U S A had lent out huge amounts to the various Governments in Europe during and after the war No agreement could be reached at the Peace Conference of Paris On the question of war debts and the reparations, majority of the states promised to repay debts after getting the war-indemnity Therefore, U S A became interested to put Germany on her feet through the Dawes Plan and the Young Plan American loans were advanced to Germany to enable her to recover from economic chaos During 1931, when the world was in the throes of worst type of economic depression, President Hoover of U S A imposed one year moratorium on both debts and reparation payments After the expiry of the moratorium, Germany declared that she would not pay any reparations Therefore, other Governments stopped payments to U S A All states, except Finland, had stopped payment of war-debts by 1933 The U S Congress passed an Act in 1934 forbidding American financiers to advance loans to the defaulter governments

5. Faith in Peaceful Settlement of International Disputes U S Government believed in solving the international disputes peacefully through arbitration, conciliation etc She played a leading role in negotiating the Kellogg-Briand Pact or Paris Pact which was finally signed by fifteen states in August, 1928 The signatories declared in the name of their people that they condemn the recourse to war for the solution of international controversies They took a vow to renounce war as an instrument of national policy

6. Sympathetic Attitude to Pan-American Countries U S A adopted an attitude of sympathy towards the Latin American states in the inter-war years The Secretary of State Hughes declared, in 1922, "We sincerely desire the independence, the unimpaired sovereignty and political integrity and the constantly increasing prosperity of the people of Latin America" The marines were withdrawn from Nicaragua in 1925 In 1926 they were again despatched

there on the plea of peaceful conditions and protection of American lives and property. This U.S. intervention was condemned at the Pan-American conference held at Havana. The relations of U.S. with the Latin-America deteriorated during the economic crisis of 1929-30. U.S.A. raised tariffs on imports to protect its own industry. A number of Latin American countries became debt defaulters during 1930-33, but U.S.A. did not take any action.

Roosevelt enunciated the policy of good neighbours. In 1933 U.S.A. gave up her treaty right to intervene in the Latin American Republics. A number of Treaties and Conventions were concluded for the purpose of constituting a purely American system tending towards the preservation of peace, proscription of war, and the harmonious development of their commerce in 1936. As a result of Italian rape of Ethiopia and Hitler's repudiation of the Versailles Treaty in 1934-35, the international situation fast deteriorated. At the Buenos Aires Convention the Pan American states adopted a resolution pleading mutual consultation in the event of the threat to the peace.

When President Cardenas of Maxico nationalised the rail-road in 1937-38, it led to the expropriation of 13 American and 4 Brazilian companies. However, President Roosevelt continued the policy of moderation by which it was agreed at the Lima Conference of December, 1938 that "in case of possible aggression or threat to peace the foreign ministers of the American States would meet in the various capitals in turn at the request of any one of them. Any such threat was to be considered a matter of common concern by all states."

Need for unity in the American hemisphere was emphasised and Neutrality Zones (extending to 300 to 1000 miles in the sea) were set up in the Panama Conference of Pan-American States, in September-December, 1939. The Pan American Conference at Havana in 1940 gave a definite shape to the principle of regional collective security. The states were obliged to take common action to meet a common threat. The Latin American countries demonstrated their solidarity with U.S.A. and declared war against Japan when she attacked the Pearl Harbour. The Latin American States decided to severe diplomatic relations with the Axis Powers after the Rio De Janeiro conference. These American Republics gave to the U.S.A. highly important and useful war materials and temporary naval and air bases during the war.

7. Preventing Emergency of a great power in the Far East. U.S.A. always wanted to prevent the emergence of a great power in East Asia, which could threaten American interests. Therefore, she followed open-door policy in China and Japan. During the War Japan became aggressive towards China. She took possession of Germany's leased territory of Kiaochow. She presented 21 demands to the Chinese government. The U.S.A., however, did not hamper the Japanese programmes. U.S.A. acquiesced in the transfer of Germany's economic rights in Shantung to Japan. The relations between U.S.A. and Japan were further

embittered by the serious naval rivalry between the two Washington Conference put a check to the naval race It constituted a great victory of American diplomacy Relations between Japan and U S A on the whole remained friendly With the end of war U S A realized that the increasing power of Japan was a menace to her interests in the Pacific Therefore, President Wilson made an attempt to restrain Japan during 1920

In September 1931, Japan attacked Manchuria The U S Government reminded Japan of her obligations under previous treaties These warnings fell on deaf ears in Tokyo, U S A announced the policy of non-recognition of territorial changes brought out by force Unmindful of these warnings, Japan continued to penetrate deeper into China An undeclared war started between China and Japan in July, 1937 In August, 1937 U S offered its good offices to settle the controversy peacefully but Japan did not show any interest in an amicable settlement During the next few years the U S Administration remained a silent spectator to Japanese conquest This attitude of non-intervention encouraged Japan to occupy Hainan and Sparately Island In 1940, however, U S A resorted to successive economic measures against the aggressive policy of Japan In 1940 Roosevelt placed an embargo on the export of scrap steel and iron to Japan U S A also tried to resolve the dispute through diplomatic negotiations

In the year 1940 Japanese alliance with the Axis powers and the occupation of southern Indo-China in the summer of 1941 ultimately led to the severance of trade by the United States Due to the futile negotiations over the Chinese question Japan attacked Pearl Harbour in December, 1941 And U S A took up arms against Japan Thus America did not follow the policy of 'isolationism' during the two world wars, but took active part in the international matters

8 Between Isolationism and Internationalism. Thus the Foreign Policy of U S A during the inter-war period was not one of isolation She took active part in various activities of the League She played a leading role with regard to disarmament, reparations, collective security, etc This was not a 'policy of internationalism' because U S A avoided unnecessary entanglements in Europe She took active interest in Far East and Latin America, only because this was necessitated and guided mainly by national considerations To conclude, the American foreign policy between the inter-war years alternated between isolationism and internationalism

FAR EAST FOREIGN POLICY

1. Till the Outbreak of World War I. Far East has played an important role in the course of international relations, since the dawn of the nineteenth century It assumed importance after the industrially advanced powers of Europe and U S A began their search for colonial markets While Russia, Germany

and France sought concessions in China, U.S.A. obtained commercial privileges and concessions in Japan. By 1890 Japan became so strong that she withdrew the concessions given to the foreigners and herself became an imperialist nation to the race for commercial concessions in China. U.S.A. followed the policy of open-door and 'administrative integrity of China, till the outbreak of World War I.

2. After the Outbreak of World War I. When the World War I broke out Japan adopted aggressive policy towards China. She took possession of Germany's leased territory of Kiao-Chou. She put up twenty-one demands to the Chinese. China made an appeal to the United States to exercise some restrain on Japan, who remained indifferent and Japan was able to have her way. In 1917, U.S.A. recognised special interest of Japan in China through Lansing-Ishii agreement. In 1918 Japan sent a large force into Siberia on the pretext of protecting that region against the Bolsheviks. To check the penetration of Japan into Siberia and North Manchuria, U.S.A. took part in the Siberian invasion.

3. Policy after the end of World War I. When the war came to an end, U.S.A. realised that the increasing power of Japan in the Far East was becoming a menace to her interests in the Pacific. At the Peace Conference of Paris President Wilson made an attempt to restrain Japan. U.S.A. opposed the transfer of Germany's economic rights in Shantung to Japan. Due to the threat of Japan to leave the Peace of Conference U.S.A. accepted the claim of Japan over Shantung. The serious naval rivalry between the two embittered the relations between the two countries.

U.S.A. convened a Conference at Washington in 1921 to put a check to the naval race. At Washington three treaties were concluded—Four Power Treaty, Five Power Treaty and the Nine Power Treaty:

1. The Four-Power Treaty. This was concluded between Great Britain, Japan, France and U.S.A. By it the signatory powers agreed to respect the rights of one another in relation to their insular possessions in the Pacific.

2. The Five-Power Treaty. It provided for naval disarmament. It fixed the ratio of the navies of the various countries. Japan was to have 60% of the American navy. These limitations related to the capital ships and did not apply to light cruisers, destroyers and submarines.

3. The Nine-Power Treaty. The signatories pledged to respect the territorial integrity of China and "to refrain from taking advantage of the conditions in China to seek special rights or privileges which would abridge the rights of subjects and citizens of friendly states". Japan agreed to return Kiao-Chou territory to China. The Washington Conference was a great victory for America. Japan was forced to surrender the gains of the World War I. She was given

an inferior position with regard to her naval strength Thus the Conference put a check, to the growing power of Japan

U.S -Japan Relationships

During 1920's relations between Japan and America on the whole remained friendly In September 1923 when Yokohama was hit by a severe earthquake U S offered 7 million dollars for the relief and rehabilitation of the sufferers of devastation In 1924 the relations between the two countries suffered a set back when the Congress of U S A passed a law stopping immigration of the Japanese into America The Mukden incident of 1921 strained the relations between the two countries Japanese had established their control over the South Manchurian Railway She was entitled to keep 15,000 soldiers in Manchuria with the headquarters at Mukden for the protection of the Railway On the night of September 18 and 19, 1931, the Japanese discovered a detachment of Chinese soldiers near Mukden, trying to blow up the South Manchurian Railway After some fighting about 10,000 Chinese soldiers in Mukden were either disarmed or dispersed The Japanese army occupied all the Chinese towns within a radius of 200 miles north of Mukden during the next four days By January 1932 the whole of Manchuria was under the control of Japan The Chinese Government lodged a protest with the League of Nations She appealed to the member states to intervene Japan gave the plea that the Japanese troops would be withdrawn The League Council decided not to take any action against Japan It passed a resolution asking Japan to withdraw from Manchuria U S A was not satisfied with this decision She tried to apply diplomatic coercion on Japan by announcing the Policy of non-recognition of territorial changes brought about by force Japan was able to retain Manchuria under her control as the League failed to take any action

Encouraged by this adventure, U S A began to think to bring the whole of Eastern Asia under her control An undeclared war between the two countries started after a clash between the Japanese and Chinese troops at the Marco Polo Bridge on July 7, 1937 In August, 1937 U S A offered its good offices to settle the controversy peacefully, Japan, however, turned down the offer The United States refused to make armed intervention when Japan was challenging the very existence of China, because she was not prepared to start a war with Japan Therefore, Japan decided to increase the orbit of her imperialist ambitions in the Far East In March 1939, she occupied the Hainan and Spratley Islands In 1940 she penetrated into South East Asia The United States Government resorted to successive economic measures against Japan to extend pressure on her She restricted the shipment of scrap iron, machine tools and other war materials to Japan

She also started strengthening her navy and defence of Pearl Harbour In June 1941, Japan forced France to sign a military agreement accepting her dominant position in Indo-China Her immediate plan was to occupy

French Indo-China, and to attack and crush the Anglo-American military power so that it may not be able to work against Japan. Knowing the Japanese plans Roosevelt sent an American Military Mission to China to assess her military needs. Soon American fliers under General Claire Chennuault began to fight the Japanese in China. A definite programme of aid to China was drawn up and the Land-Lease supplies were speeded up.

Japan and America made diplomatic efforts to come to some sort of understanding but much progress could not be made due to the opposite stand of the parties. The Naval authorities of Japan were commanding an armeda towards Hawai. On December 6, 1941 Pearl Harbour was bombarded by the Japanese War Planes. A few hours after the bombardment, Japan declared war on the U.S.A. and Great Britain. The United States became a co-belligerent of China. After the war, U.S.A. emerged as a predominant power in the Far East.

QUESTIONS FOR EXERCISE

1. Discuss the Foreign Policy of U.S.A. upto 1918.
2. Discuss the Foreign Policy of the United States from 1920 to 1941.
3. "American Foreign Policy is commonly envisaged in terms of an alternation between isolation and internationalism". (Schumann). Examine this statement with reference to American Foreign Policy between the two World Wars.
4. What was the American Foreign Policy towards the Far East after the Washington Conference.

28

Foreign Policy of Japan

RISE OF JAPAN AS WORLD POWER BEFORE 1929

Emergence as World Power

Japan consists of a group of islands around four main islands of volcanic origin She was a backward country Her economy and politics was controlled by a handful of feudal lords She attained modernisation in 1867-68 With her modernisation industrialisation was also achieved Hence Japan was on the outlook for raw materials as well as markets for her finished goods In the political sphere, she had been forced to conclude unequal treaties with a number of western powers She was keen to abrogate these treaties of con- She was also eager to become a colonial empire like them Therefore, adopted aggressive foreign policy By the end of nineteenth century Japan emerged as one of the great Powers That earned for Japan the title of 'the Rising Sun of the East' As Palmer and Perkins put it, "The Japanese slogan of 'Asia for the Asians', although it proved to be a thin disguise the Japanese imperialism had explosive effects which lasted long after the Sun of Nippon had set in the waters of the Pacific"

Japanese Expansionism

The emergence of Japan as first grade power was known to the world after she inflicted a crushing defeat on Russia in the Russo-Japanese War of 1904-05 She occupied Korea within few years of her victory over Russia During the First World War she got a golden opportunity to further her imperialistic designs As the European powers were involved in conflict in Europe, she established her authority in Asia and particularly in China She entered the war on the side of the Allied Powers She occupied the German colonies in South Pacific including Marianas, Carolinas and Marshal Islands She was able to eliminate German interest in China and occupy Shantung Besides occupation of these areas, she was keen to secure assurance from the big powers accepting her claims She got these assurances from Russia, Britain, France and Italy through a Secret Treaty of 1917, through Lansing-Ishii Agreement Even U S A recognised Japan's special interests in the Chinese provinces contiguous up to Japan After this agreement Japan played a role in the Far East identical to the American role in Western Europe

She made an effort to establish her claims in China and German colonies on a firm basis at the Peace Conference of Paris. In spite of resistance from President Wilson of U.S.A. Japan ultimately succeeded in getting her position recognised with regard to Shantung.

INTERNATIONAL ROLE OF JAPAN AFTER 1920

Washington Conference

Japan emerged a great power out of World War I. She became the greatest naval power in the East. Therefore, U.S.A. was keen to check the advance of Japan in the Far East. In spite of concluding an alliance with Japan in 1902, England also felt the need of curtailing Japan in the Far East after the elimination of Germany from that region. Therefore, a conference of the Western States was convened by U.S.A. in Washington to reconsider the Treaty of Versailles and to discuss the Disarmament problem. The Washington Conference held in November 1921 was attended by Great Britain, Japan, France, Italy, China, Portugal, Belgium, Holland and U.S.A.

Three Treaties

Three treaties were concluded at Washington, viz., Four-Power Treaty; Five-Power Treaty; and Nine-Power Treaty.

1. The *Four Power Treaty.* This treaty was signed in 1923 by U.S.A., Britain, France and Japan. The signatories agreed to respect the rights of one another in relation to their insular possession in the Pacific, and to settle all their disputes by peaceful means. They also agreed to consult each other in case of threat of war from any other power.

2. The Five-Power Treaty. This was signed in 1923 by U.S.A., Britain, France, Japan and Italy to make an effort at disarmament. The Japanese navy was to be 60% of the naval strength of England and U.S.A. And the Italian and French Navies were to be 35% of navies. These limitations related to the capital ships. They did not apply to light cruisers, destroyers and the submarines. The contracting parties agreed not to establish naval, base in any part of the Pacific excepting in the Panama Canal and the Hawaiian Islands.

3. The Nine-Power Treaty. This was signed in 1922 by Britain, U.S.A., France, Belgium, China, Japan, Italy, Holland and Portugal. The signatories agreed to respect the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of China. They had to help China in developing a strong and stable government. They had to refrain from securing special privileges of any kind in China were also recognised equal trade-rights of all countries.

Restoration of Shantung

At the Washington Conference China demanded restoration of Shantung to her. At the instance of U.S.A. and Britain, Japan signed a treaty with China

in 1922 She handed back Shantung to China in return for a huge amount of compensation She retained control over Shing-Tao Railways

Japan's History

The Washington Conference put a check on the growing naval power of Japan It also forced her to surrender the gains of World War I The western powers recognised China's sovereignty, independence and her control over her customs However, the Washington Conference led to a demand for an aggressive policy which was further strengthened in 1924 when the U S Government restricted the entry of Japanese labourers into America As Japan wanted to exploit the markets of U S A and China, she followed a policy of co-operation with these two states To exhibit Conciliatory attitude towards China she restored Kiao Chow to her and closed down all the Japanese Post Offices in China She tried to improve her relations with Russia and concluded a pact with her in 1925 She co operated with the League and signed the Kellogg-Briand Pact of 1928, which outlawed war

From 1919 to 1930

Thus from 1919 to 1930 Japan made no efforts to conquer fresh territories She, however, did not abandon her traditional policy of imperialism She once again embarked on aggressive policy after 1930 *Regarding the factors which led to this change Pannikar observed* 'With disillusionment in respect of the West, following the Washington Treaty and the social and economic disturbance caused by the change-over to an industrialized society, with the depression which affected the peasantry from whom the armed forces were recruited, the doctrine of pure Shinto revived again in a new form ' This had its impact on the foreign policy of Japan

Japan in Manchuria

Due to economic, political and strategic reasons, Japan had deep rooted interests in Manchuria Manchuria contained considerable deposits of coal, iron and oil which were badly needed by the Japanese factories Her population was increasing by leaps and bounds She was looking for additional territory for her population She had already got control over the *South Manchurian* Railway for whose protection she was entitled to keep 15,000 soldiers in Manchuria stationed at Mukden

The Japanese discovered a detachment of Chinese soldiers near Mukden on the night of September 18 and 19, 1931 trying to blow up the South Manchurian Railway After some fighting about 10,000 Chinese soldiers in Mukden were either disarmed or repressed Japanese army occupied all the Chinese towns within a radius of 200 miles north of Mukden During the next four days of January 1932, the whole of Manchuria was under the control of Japan The Chinese Government lodged a protest with the League of Nations She appealed to the member states to intervene They did not take any action

as most of the states including the United States were busy fighting the problem of depression. The League, however, appointed the Lytton Commission which admitted Chinese sovereignty over Manchuria and reported against Japan. Japan retained Manchuria under her control and left the league as a protest.

Imperialist Expansion

Encouraged by her Manchurian adventure, Japan thought of bringing the whole of eastern Asia under her control. An undeclared war started between Japan and China following a clash between the Japanese and Chinese troops at the Marco Polo bridge on July 7, 1937. This aggression ultimately merged into World War II. Most of the European states were reluctant to intervene. Even U.S.A. refused to make armed intervention because she was not prepared to start a war with Japan. Therefore, Japan decided to increase the orbit of her imperialist ambition in the Far East. In March 1939 she occupied the Hainan and Spratley Islands. In 1940, she penetrated into South East Asia. In the meanwhile, Japan had concluded Anti-Comintern Pact with Germany and Italy, which led to the formation of Rome-Berlin-Tokyo Axis to the Western opposition. To pressurise Japan, U.S. took successive economic measures against Japan and restricted the shipment of scrap iron, machine tools and other war materials to Japan.

Plunge in World War II

In June 1941, Japan exerted pressure on France to sign a military agreement accepting the dominant position of Japan in Indo-China. She had to occupy French Indo-China, and then to rapidly attack and crush the Anglo-American military powers. Knowing the Japanese Plan, Roosevelt sent an American Military Mission to China to assess her military needs. American fliers under General Claire Chennault soon began to fight the Japanese in China. As their diplomatic efforts to avert a clash between U.S.A. and Japan failed, Japan attacked Pearl Harbour. In return U.S.A. declared war on Japan. Thus the Sino-Japanese war ultimately led to World War II.

Causes for success of Japanese Policy

Japan's foreign policy was a great success till 1939, due to the failure of the Western power to offer collective resistance to Japan. If they had presented a joint opposition, Japan would have been obliged not only to leave Manchuria but also follow the terms of the previous treaties to which she was a signatory. The British Foreign Minister Sir John Simon declared that his country was not prepared to go to war against Japan on the question of Manchuria.

1. Failure of Western Powers to offer collective resistance. Gathorne Hardy justified the inaction on the part of the western powers. He has observed that "the difficulties were so great and the prospect of plunging the world in war so formidable that the inaction of the members of the League must be considered pardonable if not wholly justified".

2 Economic Crises. The success of Japanese foreign policy was also due to the fact that most of the world powers were engrossed with their domestic and economic problems created by the economic crisis of the early thirties They could not afford to pick up any political conflict with any foreign country Hence, Japan was left unopposed to follow her policy of Neo-Imperialism

3. League of Nations. The League of Nations also contributed to the success of Japanese foreign policy When the issue of Manchurian attack was brought before the League by China it failed to take any firm action It only appointed Lytton Commission to go into the issue, a further fillip to Japan's policy of aggression

4 Internal strifes in China The success of Japan's foreign policy was also due to the internal strifes in China They prevented her from offering stiff resistances to Japan

Impact of Japanese Foreign Policy

The significance of Japanese foreign policy is clear from the fact that it gave encouragement to aggressive policies of other powers As Mackintosh has said "Both Italy and Germany concluded that there was little risk in making treaties and carrying out aggressions, since the League Powers ' both to act in concert Japan called the bluff of the League and proved the world that even a slight danger of war was enough to cool the order of its supporters"

SINO-JAPANESE RELATIONS 1919-1941

1. Japanese Attack in 1895 China and Japan have been traditional enemies in the Far East Japan became a leading commercial, industrial and military power in the Pacific Ocean after modernisation In 1895 Japan attacked China and inflicted severe military defeat on her as she was keen to get the concessions extended to other powers by China She seized the Island of Formosa and established her claims on the Chinese Northern province of Manchuria

2. Occupation of Shantung When the First World War broke out China chose to remain neutral *She took advantage of German difficulties and* reoccupied the German occupied province of Shantung Japan sent her troops to Kiao-Chou and Shantung She took full advantage of European power's involvement in the War She placed "Twenty-one Demands" before China, which were accepted by the Chinese government As a result Shantung was transferred to Japan, she was also given military position in Manchuria, and accorded facilities concerning coal and iron China agreed not to allow any foreign power, except Japan, to establish any kind of authority in the Chinese port

SINO-JAPANESE RELATIONS 1919-1941

1. Japanese Attack in 1895. China and Japan have been traditional enemies in the Far East. Japan became leading commercial, industrial and military power in the Pacific Ocean after modernisation. In 1895 Japan attacked China and inflicted severe military defeat on her as she was keen to get the concessions extended to other powers by China. She seized the island of Formosa and established her claims on the Chinese Northern province of Manchuria.

2. Occupation of Shantung. When the First World War broke out China chose to remain neutral. She took advantage of German difficulties and reoccupied the German occupied province of Shantung. Japan sent her troops to Kiao-Chou and Shantung. She took full advantage of European powers' involvement in the War. She placed 'Twenty-one Demands' before China which were accepted by the Chinese government. As a result Shantung was transferred to Japan. She was also given military position in Manchuria and accorded facilities concerning coal and iron. China agreed not to allow any foreign power, except Japan, to establish any kind of authority in the Chinese port.

3. Paris Peace Conference. In 1917, China entered the war under pressure from Allies. At the end of war, she was invited to participate in the Paris Peace Conference. At the conference she raised the demands for the return of Shantung and cancellation of unequal treaties with foreign powers. But she could not secure any concession due to Japan's threat of leaving the Peace Conference. The Treaty of Versailles incorporated that Japan would succeed to the German position in Shantung, subject to the condition that Japan would restore to China, by direct negotiation, all political rights in the province, retaining for herself only the economic rights and privileges. Under the terms of Boxer Protocol, China was relieved of all her obligations to Germany.

4. Protest to Treaty of Versailles. The terms of Treaty of Versailles gave rise to a strong student movement in China against the foreigners, particularly the Japanese. As a result of this agitation, Japan indicated her willingness to negotiate with China her promise regarding Shantung. No progress could be made as the Chinese Government wanted 'complete and unconditional' restoration of Shantung.

5. Washington Conferences. The Washington Conferences were held from November 12, 1921 to February 6, 1922. These concluded six treaties and passed twelve resolutions besides the bilateral treaty between China and Japan. Of these, two dealt with Sino-Japanese problems. These were 'Nine Power Open Door Treaty' and 'Sino-Japanese Treaty'.

6 **Nine Power Open Door Treaty** The signatories to this treaty pledged to respect the sovereignty of China The members agreed to maintain and advance the principle of equality of commercial opportunity in China The states were required not to take or support any action designed to create spheres of interest or to provide for the enjoyment of mutually exclusive opportunities in designed parts of Chinese territory However, the treaty contained no sanctions It primarily depended upon the good faith of the powers

7. **Sino-Japanese Treaty** Sino Japanese Treaty was concluded on *February 4, 1922 By it Shantung was returned to China in January, 1923* Japan was permitted to retain control of the Tsinan-Tsingtao Railway for a period of fifteen years

8 **Conciliation to China** In view of the rising tide of nationalist revolutionary movement in China, Japan felt that "the future of Japan's industrial and commercial progress lay in a policy of conciliation and adjustment to China's new nationalism without renunciation of Japan's life line in South Manchuria As a result Japan started treating China on equal terms This attitude of Japan became visible in 1925 when as a result of shooting in Shanghai some Chinese were killed, and Japan readily agreed to pay compensation to the bereaved families Similarly in 1927 when the Japanese consulate in Nanking was attacked by the Kuomintang troops and several Japanese were wounded, Japan did not participate in the Anglo American bombardment of Nanking During 1924-27, there was no feeling of ill will against Japan in China

9 ***More Positive Policy*** *In 1927 with coming of General* Tanaka Japan adopted more 'positive' policy towards China In June 1927 she sent her troops to Shantung to check the further advance of the Kuomintang troops towards Peking In 1928, she sent troops to Tsinan for the protection of Japanese *economic interests On May 3, 1927 there was a clash between Japanese* and Chinese troops In this clash the Japanese suffered heavy casualties The 'positive' policy of Tanaka was severely criticised in Japan Ultimately the Tsinan incident was settled through diplomatic channels

10. **Eye on Manchuria** Under the stress of depression of early thirties a number of states imposed high tariffs to protect their indigenous industries The condition of Japanese industry became most miserable She needed constantly expanding markets for her goods This led to search for colonies As she had already occupied Korea, Manchuria became her next target Manchuria was rich in minerals like coal, iron, gold and timber It had plenty of food-stuffs which Japan needed badly Control of Manchuria was of strategic importance to Japan because it could serve as a valuable base for offensive or defensive operations against both China and Soviet Union Its location made it a fit place for rehabilitating the constantly growing Japanese population

11. Mukden Incident. Due to the opposition of Western powers Japan could not establish her hegemony over Manchuria. In 1931 the European powers were pre-occupied with their economic problems arising out of the great depression. This was the most opportunate time for Japan. On the night of September 18-19, 1931, the Chinese soldiers attempted to blow up the mainline of South Manchurian Railway over which Japan had acquired right under the Treaty of Portsmouth, 1905. The Japanese soldiers immediately went into action and disarmed about 19,000 Chinese soldiers. During the next four days, the Japanese captured all the towns within a radius of 200 miles north of Mukden. Under Article 11 of the Covenant China made an appeal to the League Council. On September 30, 1931 the Council passed a resolution asking Japan to withdraw her troops and restore normal relations. Lytton Commission of five powers U.K., U.S.A., France, Germany and Italy was set up to investigate the problem on the spot. In its report it declared Japan's action as 'naked aggression'. Moreover the Japanese armies continued their onward march. By the end of 1932 Japan occupied the whole of Manchuria now designated as Manchukuo (a new state). Thus Japan respected Chinese territorial and political integrity. However no sanctions were applied against her.

12. Hostilities against China. In 1935 some local Japanese military officials established a puppet regime under the name of East Hopei Autonomous Government. The Japanese started illicit trade in this region with a view to sap and exploit the resources and efficiency of the Chinese administration to aggrandize herself. Encouraged by the anti-Comintern Pact with Italy and Germany as well as by the appeasement policy of the Western nations, Japan started full-fledged hostilities against China in 1937. The trouble started over Marco Polo Bridge near Peking and by the end of July hostilities spread over the whole of North China. On December 15, 1937 the Japanese occupied the city of Nanking.

13. Chinese United Front. In July, 1937 Chiang Kai Shek gave a stirring call to the Chinese people and urged them to "fight to the finish as one man". A United Front was formed on September 22, 1937 by the Kuomintang Government and the Chinese Communist Party. Japan offered the terms of peace, which included (i) Chiang Kai-Shek should repudiate communism, (ii) Recognise Manchukuo, (iii) Pay the costs of war, and (iv) Appoint Japanese advisers to conduct the administration. The Chinese contemptuously rejected the peace offer and Japan resumed fighting in 1938. She captured the Island of Hainan in February and Spratley Islands in March, 1939. In March, 1940, Japan set up a puppet regime at Nanking under Wang Chang Wei and entered into a number of agreements with it. U.S.A. tried to exert pressure on Japan by resorting to economic measures against her. In 1941 she sent Military Missions to China to assess her military needs. Soon the American

fliers under General Claire Chennault began to fight the Japanese in China After heavy losses Japan surrendered China, along with other members of camp, shared the glory of military triumph But soon she became involved in a bloody civil war which resulted in the victory of Communism in 1949

QUESTIONS FOR EXERCISE

1 Explain the rise of Japan as world power before 1920

2 Discuss the role of Japan in the international relations between 1920-1924

3 "The Japanese conquest of Manchuria war one of the most important historical landmarks since the First World War" (E H Carr) Do you agree? Give reasons

4 What were the basic issues of conflict between China and Japan between 1927 and 1939? Account for the successive defeats of China at the hands of Japan

29

Second World War (1939-1945)

On September 1, 1939 Hitler attacked Poland and occupied it. France and England warned Hitler and asked him to call back his army. Hitler refused. Hence France and England declared war with Germany.

Italy and Japan sided with Germany. In the beginning Stalin, the Russian Leader, took the side of Germany, but afterwards, he opposed it when Germany attacked Russia in 1941.

MAIN EVENTS OF THE SECOND WORLD WAR

1. **Poland Defeated.** On 1 September, 1939 Germany attacked Poland and defeated it. Germany and Russians partitioned it.

2. ***Hitler attacked Norway and Denmark.*** England promised to protect Norway and Denmark against German attack but failed to send its armies in time. Therefore, Hitler conquered both.

3. **France Defeated.** On June 30, 1940, Germany attacked France. Italy sided with Germany. Germany occupied Paris. France surrendered to Germany.

4. **Holland and Belgium Defeated.** Germany attacked Holland and Belgium and defeated them. British evacuated Dunkirk.

5. **Germany attacked England.** In August 1940, Germany made air raids on England but England pushed back the German soldiers.

6. **Germany attacked Russia on 22nd June, 1941.** This was done without any provocation, but only to get hold of vast Russian resources. Leningrad was sieged. Hitler, however, failed to overpower Russians and was defeated.

7. **Russia and England made a pact with the U.S.A.** On August 1941 England and Russia signed Atlantic Charter.

8. **Japan attacked Pearl Harbour on November 7, 1941.** Pearl Harbour was the Naval base of U.S.A. America declared war on Japan. England, Australia, Canada, Holland declared war on Axis powers (Germany, Japan, Rumania, Hungary and Italy). Thus entire Europe became engaged in the war.

9. Battles in North Africa (1941-43). Italy and Germany waged war in North Africa against the Allies who freed Abyssinia from Italian control Italy and Germany retreated The Allies routed German armies

10. Italy Overpowered. In 1943 Allies attacked Italy and occupied Rome Italy surrendered unconditionally Mussolini resigned and dissolved the Italian Fascist Party On April 1944 the Italian partisans shot dead Mussolini and his mistress

11. Germany Overpowered Germany retreated on all war zones In 1945 Allies liberated France, Belgium, Holland and Bulgaria Russia attacked Germany from East On April 8, 1945 Hitler and his mistress Eva Braun committed suicide On 7th May, 1945 German forces surrendered to the Allies

12. Japan Surrendered. Japan which had conquered and occupied Malaya, Philippines and Sarawak on November, 1941 had to retreat when Americans invaded Okinavia in 1945 Japanese cabinet resigned On 6 August, 1945 America dropped Atom Bomb on Hiroshima and on 9 August, 1945, they bombed Nagasaki This forced Japanese to surrender unconditionally on 14 August, 1945

13. Second World War Ended. On 14 August, 1945 the Second World War ended

THE CONSEQUENCES OF THE SECOND WORLD WAR

1. Dangerous Disaster. More than 5 crore people died in which 2 crore and 20 lakh were innocent citizens More than 1 crore 20 lakh people died in German and Italian war camps Crores of people became homeless Maximum loss was borne by Germany and Russia

2. Economic Results. Most of the European nations spent all their economic resources in fighting the war Their economies shattered Inflation, black marketing and unemployment gripped nations of the world after the war

3. Social Effects. Many social evils developed The dangerous effects of atomic bombing in Japan affected Japanese social life very adversely.

4 Political Consequence :

(i) Germany was divided into two parts East Germany and West Germany Russians occupied the Eastern Germany and the Western Germany came under the control of Britain, America and France

(ii) Fascism met its end in Italy Democracy was established Militarism died African colonies were lost

(iii) Military power of Japan was ruined Democratic government was set up in Japan

(iv) America and U.S.S.R. became powerful nations. The world was divided into two blocks between them.

(a) U.S.A. supplied capitalism while,

(b) U.S.S.R. was the leader of socialists.

In the socialist camp two groups emerged under the socialist Russia and the Communist China.

5. The Imperialist countries lost their authority and control over their colonies. The slave countries became free through their freedom struggle. The imperialist countries had to transfer power to native states. India, Burma, Ceylon, Indonesia, Sudan, Egypt etc. became free sovereign republics.

6. Atom bomb was first used in this war. An armament race started and atomic bombs began to be made.

7. Being frightened by increasing Russian power America and some other countries became anxious and united themselves into groups such as NATO, SEATO, and CENTO.

8. On June 26, 1945, U.N. Charter was signed at San Fransisco. On 24 October, 1945, the U.N.O. was set up.

The first regular session of the United Nations Assembly was held in London in January 1946.

THE CAUSES OF SECOND WORLD WAR

1. Follies of Victors at Versailles. Concluded in 1919 the Treaty of Versailles was based on the spirit of revenge as Germany was forced to sign the treaty at the point of bayonet. She was deprived of her colonies, territories and natural resources. She was burdened with reparations which were beyond her capacity to pay. Analysing the injustice inherent in the Treaty of Versailles Carr observes: "Nearly every treaty which brings a war to an end is, in one sense, a dictated peace; for a defeated power seldom accepts the consequences of its defeat willingly. But in the Treaty of Versailles the element of dictation was more apparent than in any previous peace treaty of modern times." This element of dictation and humiliation gave rise to spirit of revenge. Germany started looking for an opportunity to tear off the Versailles treaty. The Nazi movement in Germany and the rise of Hitler gave a ray of hope to the German people. After assuming power Hitler started demolishing the structure raised by the Treaty of Versailles. As Cyril Falls puts it "The World War II was essentially a war of revenge initiated by Germany. It cannot be denied that Germany stood first and foremost for revenge. The other aim was the 'living room' to be obtained by the subjugation of neighbouring states, the absorption of all Teutonic or so called Teutonic populations, the colonization of agricultural districts like Ukraine, the control of all major industries in

Europe were either the means of consolidating the revenge once achieved or the expression of purely predatory instinct such as had always flourished in Prussia and were later in diffused all over Germany Hitler stood first for rearmament and revenge and then for loot and German domination

2 **Rise of Fascism in Italy.** The rise of Fascism in Italy was also responsible for World War II Glorifying War, Mussolini, the Fascist leader said "War alone brings upto their highest tension all human energies and puts the stamp of nobility upon people who have the courage to meet it" Italy sought to revive the glory of the Old Roman Empire She annexed Abyssinia In Spain she placed General Franco in the saddle She joined the Anti Comintern Pact in 1937 In 1939 she concluded a ten years alliance with Germany by which both the countries agreed to help each other in war

3 **Japanese Imperialism** After World War I Japan secured many concessions at the peace conference which were taken away from her by the Washington Conference of 1921-22 But she was determined to dominate the Far East In 1931 Japan intervened in Manchuria She occupied it in spite of Leagues opposition She started an undeclared war against China in 1937 and captured her cities one after another Chinese war was still on when the World War II started Japan had already joined Berlin-Rome-Tokyo Axis It gave a further impetus to her programme of expansion and conquest Under the circumstances a war was inevitable

4 **Failure of Collective Security** The League was created after World War I with a view to eliminate war as and instrument of policy When U S A could not join League it suffered an early blow States who accepted membership of the League showed indifference to the principle of collective security The coercive machinery of the League was not adequate to cope with the task entrusted to it Economic sanctions were useless against a determined aggressor The states were not willing to apply the economic sanctions because it hit their economy adversely when she occupied Manchuria and attacked China Japan was the first country to hit the collective security system League could not check Japan When the League censured Japan for her invasion of China, she left the League Encouraged by example of Japan, Italy occupied Ethiopia in 1935 and Albania in 1936 Though the League imposed economic sanction upon Italy other members did not apply them German defied the Treaty of Versailles in 1936 and re-armed herself She occupied Austria and Czechoslovakia by force in 1938 In 1939 Russia attacked Finland, though this led to her expulsion from the League Thus the League failed to maintain international peace Therefore, countries of Europe lost faith in its efficacy They entered into mutual political and military alliances

5. **Failure of disarmament** Another cause of World War II was the failure of disarmament Article 8 of the Covenant of the League had enjoined on the members to take steps for the reduction of national armament to the

lowest point consistent with national safety. But they entered into a race of re-armament. As they had no faith in the system of collective security guaranteed by the League. Due to mutual distrust of the various Conferences for Disarmament both within and outside the League failed to achieve much. Germany was compulsorily disarmed. England was the only other country to reduce arms. After 1935 even Germany introduced conscription in violation of the Treaty of Versailles. Other totalitarian states also followed the principle of 'guns before butter'. This race for armaments had disastrous result for the security of peace loving countries.

6. Ideological Conflict. A basic cause of World War II was the ideological conflict between the Fascist states Germany, Italy and Japan and democratic States Great Britain, France and U.S.A. Commenting on the ideological conflict Mussolini remarked, "The struggle between the two worlds can permit no compromise—Either we or they." This conflict was inevitable due to their different approaches to politics. The democratic countries stood for maintenance of *status quo.* On the other hand the Fascist states were keen to expand. Japan was land hungry. She was determined to establish her supremacy in the Far East. Germany and Italy wanted to expand their territories. All this inevitably to a clash with the powers, who were not willing to sacrifice their colonial empires.

7. Western Attitude towards Russia. Western powers continued to treat Russia as an outcast. They were scared of Bolshevism. Therefore they encouraged the Fascist and Pro-Fascist politicians in the West against Bolshevik expansion. They failed to realise that the Fascist aggression was directed not only against Russia but also against them. Hence it was a folly on his part to spurn the offer of friendship and truce made by Russia. Russia got frustrated with the attitude of Western powers. She concluded a no war pact with Germany.

8. Policy of Appeasement. England and France adopted policy of appeasement towards the 'Dictators'. This contributed largely to the outbreak of World War II. The protagonists of appeasement policy believed that the dictators had a real cause of grievance and they would leave others alone if their grievances were removed. This policy of appeasement was also due to their desire to divert Germany towards Russian Bolshevism. Therefore, Germany was allowed to rearm, to remilitarize the Rhineland, and capture Austria and Czechoslovakia.

To conclude, the Second World War was the outcome of the follies of the victors, rise of Fascism in Italy, Japanese imperialism, collapse of collective security, failure of disarmament, ideological conflict and the policy of appeasement pursued by Great Britain and France. It was a result of the ambitions of Germany who wanted to rule over the whole of the world.

APPEASEMENT POLICY

Meaning of Appeasement Policy

The British, American and French policy makers took a series of steps in the thirties of the present century to solve the foreign policy dilemmas These have been termed as 'policy of appeasement' During this period Germany, Italy and Japan, in spite of their aggressive activities, were not offered any resistance by U S A , England or France Directly or indirectly they were to go ahead with their policy of aggression Britain, France and U S A had sufficient power to desist the fascist countries from aggression but they deliberately allowed them to flout all international agreements and commitments

Causes of Appeasement Policy

1. Fear of Communism U S A , England and France were very much afraid of Communism They felt that Bolshevism was a greater threat than the designs of Germany, Italy and Japan Therefore, they deliberately encouraged Germany to strengthen herself to check the Russian menace and divert her attention to the Russian Bolshevism Hitler could sense this fear of the Western Powers He fully exploit it by declaring that he was fighting against the Bolshevism Therefore, each advance of Hitler and Mussolini was considered an important step in arresting the progress of communism in the world

2. Balance of Power. An important reason which prompted the Democratic Powers to follow the policy of appeasement towards Germany, Italy and Japan was that they felt that they would check each other and thereby maintain a balance of power They believed that Germany and her allies would destroy Russia It would rid the world of Communist danger Therefore, they encouraged Germany and Italy to infringe the Treaty of Versailles and commit aggression By allowing Germany and her allies to become too powerful this attitude of the Democratic powers actually endangered the balance of power

3 Economic Depression The economic depression of early thirties adversely effected the economies of almost all the countries of the world including those of England, France and U S A It was also responsible for the policy of appeasement towards Germany and Italy Due to it, numerous social and economic problems cropped up in these countries These drew the attention of the governments there The problems of inflation, depression and unemployment were serious problems These would have threatened the existence of these countries if not immediately tackled Therefore, out of sheer necessity these governments had to adopt a policy of indifference towards Germany and Italy

4. Illusion of Limited Appetite of Dictators. These powers were prompted to adopt the policy of appeasement due to their illusory faith and belief that the dictators had a limited appetite. They believed that Germany and Italy and genuine grievance and they would not disturb the peace of Europe if these grievances are satisfied. This belief was based on utterances of Hitler from time to time. In violation of the Treaty of Versailles he promised to keep up the Locarno Pact. Similarly, he declared that he had no further territorial ambitions when he violated the Locarno Pact.

5. Selfish Interests of England, France and U.S.A. These Countries followed appeasement policy towards Germany, Italy and Japan for selfish reasons to check the Soviet influence and preserve the interests of her nationals in China. England adopted the policy of appeasement towards Japan in Far East. She appeased Italy to secure her cooperation against Nazi Germany. She followed policy of appeasement towards Germany partly because of British differences with France and partly because she saw in Germany an effective check against Russian expansion. France followed appeasement towards Italy. To use her as a bulwark against Germany because of her dependence on Britain. She was compelled to follow appeasement towards Germany.

U.S.A. adopted policy of appeasement towards Italy and Germany as she was not interested in involving herself in European affairs. She wanted to concentrate her attention in the Far East, where she was facing a strong rival in Japan.

Impact of Appeasement Policy

Due to the policy of appeasement, Germany accomplished union with Austria and occupied Czechoslovakia. Ultimately, England and her allies realised the inadequacy and inefficacy of this policy. On March 17, 1939 Chamberlain declared British resistance "to the utmost of its power to any power which attempted to dominate the world by force." She proceeded to give guarantees to Poland, Greece and Romania. At home, she announced the adoption of military conscription. While giving a guarantee to Turkey in May 1939 she declared "No more deadly mistakes could be made than to assume that Britain and France were not in earnest and could not be relied upon to carry out their promises."

Criticism of the Appeasement Policy

The critics of policy of appeasement point out that this policy was based on wrong assumptions. It should have been abandoned as soon as the designs of Axis powers became clear. After 1937, when the designs of Nazi Germany became clear, it was a folly to have persisted with this policy. The defenders of the policy of appeasement argue that this policy was necessary to postpone the war and to gain time for the Western powers to prepare themselves for the inevitable struggle. Mr. Chamberlain played for time by pursuing this policy

after 1937 It provided the time necessary for preparing the western world for the struggle against the fascist powers This argument appears sound and logical The Western powers did get time to increase their military strength But Germany and other Axis powers did not sit idle The time given by the appeasement policy went more in favour of the Axis powers than the Allies Germany was able to effect relatively more increase in number and quality of her army Further, Allies were robbed of the Czech Army of twenty-one regular divisions As subsequent facts and Nuremberg trial revealed, if war had started on October 1, 1938, it was almost certain that Germany would have been quickly defeated Britain and France created a situation by their inaction under which the democracies had to go to war under much worse conditions

Other Causes of World War II

The World War II was not solely due to the policy of appeasement followed by Great Britain, France and U S A towards Germany and her allies By following this policy these powers undoubtedly allowed the fascists countries the time to increase their strength and thereby offers stiffer resistance, which made the victory difficult But it is wrong to presume that if the Western Powers had followed a different policy, the World War II could have been averted It shows complete lack of understanding of the German and Japanese character The treaty of Versailles which harshly treated Germany and gave rise to the spirit of revenge sowed the seeds of the Second World War Likewise though Japan was curtailed at the Washington Conference of 1921, but she refused to accept a secondary position as she wanted to dominate Far East Though fought on the side of Allies during the First World War, Italy did not get good treatment Many of her aspirations remained unfulfilled at Paris Peace Conference In the Inter-war period, she worked feverishly to get the Treaty of Versailles modified in her favour Therefore the Second World War could not have been averted if the Western powers had not followed policy of appeasement On the contrary as Schumann says, "The peril could probably have been averted by coming to terms with Russia for a Grand Alliance to checkmate the Axis This the Tory leaders were never willing to do, since they seem to regard any extension of Soviet power as more dangerous to Britain than any extension to German power"

THE ADVENT OF THE ATOMIC AGE

Early on the morning of August 6, 1945, an American B-29 bomber dropped a single atom bomb on the Japanese city of Hiroshima marking the advent of the Atomic Age in warfare The blinding flash of the explosion a few seconds later was followed by the appearance of a mushroomed-shaped cloud which soon towered for miles over the doomed city Some 150,000 people were killed or wounded—and many of the latter were to die in agony from radiation effects—and 75 per cent of the buildings of the city were destroyed or badly

damaged. A short time later in a broadcast heard around the world, the President of the United States, announced that "the basic power of the universe" had been unleashed against Japan. In a single moment, problems of international conflict and cooperation, of war and peace, had become questions of the future of mankind, even of its survival. Since Hiroshima, the hydrogen bomb and experiments with bacteriological and chemical weapons have improved the techniques of mass destruction to the point where the atom bomb itself is hardly more than a conventional weapon. Efforts have been made to adjust man's thinking and institutions to the imperatives of the atomic age. However these efforts have fallen far short of the dimensions of the crisis. Paul-Henri Spaak, one of the world's wisest statesmen, in 1955, said "Truly, our imagination is not in step with our era."[1]

Albert Schweitzer stated in his address in Oslo on November 4, 1954, on his receipt of the Nobel Peace Prize: "Man has become a superman.....because he is in command .....of latent forces in nature," but he "is not elevated to that level of superhuman reason which must correspond to the possession of superhuman force."

That birthday of the atomic age was December 2, 1942, when, "amid the greatest wartime secrecy," a small group of scientists, gathered on a squash court underneath the west stands of the University of Chicago's abandoned football stadium, watched the lighting of "the first atomic fire of earth."

Fermi, Bohr, and other physicists exiled from Europe to U.S.A. learned that a special institute had been created in Berlin for work on an atom bomb. They understood the grave consequences if the Nazis should perfect such a weapon ahead of the free world. They induced the most famous of the scientist-exiles in America, Albert Einstein, to write a now-historic letter to President Roosevelt, stressing the urgency of investigating the possibilities of developing an atomic bomb. The risk was taken, and the atomic age was the result.

On August 13, 1942, the "Manahattan District" was officially established in the Army Corps of Engineers to carry on the special project, with Major General Leslie R. Groves in charge. Canadian and British scientists were enlisted to aid the American and exiled European scientists. At Chicago, as we have noted, the first nuclear chain reaction was achieved in December, 1942. At Los Alamos, New Mexico, Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer directed a group of scientists, including Fermi and Bohr, in designing and building the first bomb. Other research centres were established at Oak Ridge, Tennessee, and elsewhere. The first atom bomb ever to be tested was exploded at Alamogordo, New Mexico, on July 16, 1945. It was remarkable that, a project of such

1. Paul-Henri Spaak, "The Atom Bomb and NATO," *Foreign Affairs*, XXXIII (April 1955), 359.

dimensions could be undertaken and completed in full secrecy, during a major war eventually involving an expenditure of more than two billion dollars and the labour of some 300,000 workers

On April 25, 1945, nine days after he had become President, Truman learned from Mr Stimson's memorandum that within four months the United States would in all probability possess "the most terrible weapon ever known in human history" One with which "modern civilization might be completely destroyed"

From the day of Stimson's "enlightening presentation of this awesome subject" until he left the White House nearly eight years later, President Truman was involved in a series of decisions regarding the development and control of the atom bomb and even more fearful weapons of mass destruction The decision to drop the bomb on Hiroshima and Nagasaki was his to make, and he made it upon the advice of his most trusted advisers Disagreement over the military and moral justification of that decision continues to this day

In the spring of 1946, a committee headed by Dean Acheson produced the so-called Acheson-Lilienthal Plan for an international atomic development authority At the first meeting of the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission the American representative, Bernard Baruch, submitted a proposal modulated on the Acheson-Lilienthal Plan The American plan was accepted by the majority of the members of the commission and later approved by the General Assembly Nearly eight years later, in December, 1953, President Eisenhower advanced a proposal for the pooling of atomic resources for peaceful uses A sub committee of the Disarmament Commission studied it in some detail Late in the summer of 1955 an international conference on the peaceful uses of atomic energy as held in Geneva attended largely by scientists

The United States enjoyed a monopoly of atomic bombs until 1949, which, many Western statesmen including Winston Churchill, regarded this condition as the chief deterrent to Soviet aggression and the chief shield for Western Europe On September 23, 1949, all complacency arising from the American monopoly was shattered by President Truman's announcement that Russia had recently exploded her first atomic bomb Britain became the third member of the "nuclear club" on October 3, 1952 France, the fourth member on February 13, 1960 China, the fifth member on October 16, 1964 Thus in the first two decades of the atomic age five states had joined the "nuclear club"

QUESTIONS FOR EXERCISE

1. Discuss the causes and events that led to Second World War.
2. What is meant by appeasement policy? How far do you think it was responsible for World War II.
3. How far was the foreign policy of England and France responsible for the outbreak of Second World War? Could they have averted it by pursuing a different policy?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ARON RAYMOND, *Peace and War A Theory of International Relations* Garden City, N Y Doubleday & Company, 1966

BANKS ARTHUR S and ROBERT B TEXTOR, *A Cross-polity Survey* Cambridge, Mass The M I T Press, 1963

BOASSON, CHARLES, *Approaches to the Study of International Relations* Assen, The Netherlands, 1963

BOULDING, KENNETH E, *Conflict and Defense a General Theory* New York Harper & Row, 1962

BURTON, J W *International Relations A General Theory* Cambridge, England, 1965

CARR, E H, *The Twenty Year's Crisis*, 1919-1939, 2nd ed London, 1946

CLAUDE, INIS L, Jr, *Power and International Relations* New York Random- house, 1962

DEUTSCH, KARL, *The Analysis of International Relations* Englewood Cliffs, NJ Prentice-Hall, 1968

DEUTSCH, KARL, *The Nerves of Government* New York The Free Press of Glencoe, 1963

FARRELL, R BARRY, ed *Approaches to Comparative and International Politics* Evanston, Ill Northwestern University Press, 1966

FISHER, ROGER D, ed *International Conflict and Behavioral Science, the Craigville Papers* New York Basic Book, 1964

FOX, WILLIAM T R *The American Study of International Relations* Columbia, S C The University of South Carolina Press, 1968

FOX, WILLIAM T R, ed *Theoretical Aspects of International Relations* Notre Dame, Ind University of Notre Dame Press, 1959

GRETZKOW, HAROLD *et al Simulation in International Relations Development for Research and Teaching.* Englewood Cliffs, N J Prentice-Hall, 1963

HARRISON, HORACE V, ed *The Role of Theory in International Relations* Princeton, N J D Van Nostrand Co, 1963

HERZ, JOHN H *Political Realism and Political Idealism A study in Theories and Realities* Chicago University of Chicago Press, 1951

HOFFMANN, STANLEY, ed *Contemporary Theory in International Relations* Englewood Cliffs, N J Prentice-Hall, 1960

HOFFMANN, STANLEY, ed. *The State of War: Essays on the Theory and Practice of International Politics.* New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1965.

KAPLAN MORTON, *System and Process in International Politics.* New York: John Wiley, 1957.

KELMAN, HERBERT C., ed. *International Behaviour: A Socio-Psychological Analysis.* New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1965.

KIRK, GRAYSON. *The Study of International Relations in American Colleges and Universities.* New York: Council on Foreign Relations, 1947.

KNORR, KLAUS, and SIDNEY VERBA, eds. *The International System: Theoretical Essays.* Princeton. N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1961.

KUHN, HAROLD W., ed. *Game Theory, Bargaining and International Relations.* A special issue of *The Journal of Conflict Resolution,* VI (March, 1962).

LERCHE, CHARLES O., Jr. and ABDUL A. SAID. *Concepts of International Politics.* Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1963.

LERNER, MAX. *The Age of Overkill A Preface to World Politics* New York: Simon and Schuster, 1962

LISKA, GEORGE. *International Equilibrium* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1957.

McCLELLAND, CHARLES A. *Theory and the International System.* New York: The Macmillan Company, 1966.

McNEIL, ELTON R., ed. *The Nature of Human Conflict.* Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1965.

MANNING, C.A.W. *The University Teaching of Social Science International Relations* Paris, 1954.

MATHIESEN, TRYGVE. *Methodology in the Study of International Relations* Oslo, 1959.

MODELSKI, GEORGE A. *A Theory of Foreign Policy.* New York: Frederick A. Praeger, the Center of International Studies, Princeton University, 1962.

OLSON, WILLIAM C. and FRED A. SONDERMAN. *The Theory and Practice of International Relations,* 2nd ed. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1966.

RAPOPORT, ANATOL. *Fights, Games and Debates* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1960.

ROSENAU, JAMES N., ed. *International Politics and Foreign Policy: A Reader in Research and Theory.* New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1961.

ROSECRANCE, RICHARD N. *Action and Reaction in World Politics.* Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1963.

RUSSELL, F.M. *Theories of International Relations.* New York: Appleton-Century, 1936.

RUSSETT, BRUCE M. *et al. World Handbook of Political and Social Indicators.* New Haven, Yale University Press, 1964.

SCHELLING, THOMAS C *The Strategy of Conflict* Cambridge, Mass Harvard University Press, 1960

SCOTT, ANDREW M with WILLIAM A LUCAS and TRUDI M LUCAS *Simulation and National Development* New York John Wiley & Sons, 1966

SINGER, J DAVID *Human Behaviour and International Politics Contributions from the Social-Psychological Science* Chicago Rand McNally & Co, 1965

SINGER, J DAVID, ed *Quantitative International Politics Insights and Evidence* New York The Free Press of Glencoe, 1967

SNYDER, RICHARD C and JAMES A ROBINSON *National and International Decision-Making* New York Institute for International Order, 1961

TOMA, PETER A and ANDREW GYORGY, eds *Basic Issues in International Relations* Boston Allyn & Bacon, 1967

VAN DYKE, VERNON, ed *The Teaching of International Politics* Ames The State University of Iowa, 1955

WALTZ, KENNETH N *Man, the State and War* New York Columbia University Press, 1959

WRIGHT, QUINCY *The Study of International Relations* New York Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1955

ZAWODNY, J K *Guide to the Study of International Relations* San Francisco Chandler-Publishing Co, 1966

ZAWODNY, J K ed *Man and International Relations* 2 vols San Francisco Chandler Publishing Co, 1967 Vol I Conflict, Vol II Integration